

THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOL. IV. No. 3.

JULY, 1911.

SAVINGS AND THE SOCIAL WELFARE.

The following paper was read by Mr. George Paish, Editor of *The Statist*, at an afternoon meeting of the Sociological Society, held in the Hall of the Royal Society of Arts, Adelphi, W.C., on May 2, 1911. The chair was taken by Mr. A. C. Cole, Governor of the Bank of England.

No feature of modern life has struck the popular imagination more than the display of wealth which is so conspicuous in every part of the world to-day. Money is now spent with a profusion which would have amazed our fathers, and was totally unknown and impossible to former generations. The expenditures of the nations upon armaments are incredibly great; indeed, in the aggregate, they are greater to-day in peace than they ever were in war. The sums spent upon travel and upon recreation are almost incalculable in their magnitude. Floating hotels carry the well-to-do from country to country in a state of luxury that kings could not afford a generation or two ago. Sumptuous trains worked at heavy cost convey travellers with great rapidity over the larger part of the earth's surface. The motor-car, notwithstanding its expensiveness to construct and to run, has become the plaything of a great many persons who, but a short time ago, were unable to set up a carriage and who now spend hundreds per annum when previously they could not spend tens of pounds. Every coast and nearly every beautiful district on the earth's surface are studded with hotels or summer residences, and in these days the multitude spends some portion of the year in recreation on the sea coast, or in the country. Upon ornamentation and upon dress the outlays have expanded in a remarkable manner. Gold has replaced silver as the ornament of the masses over the greater part of the world, and even so poor a country as India is now using two or three times as much gold as formerly. Furthermore, the demand for pearls, diamonds,

and other precious stones has never been so universal as it has been in recent years. Probably, one of the greatest indications of the vast increase in the world's wealth in modern times is in the sums now expended on what the womanfolk term "dress." One can visit no city, town, or village in Europe, or in the new countries either, without being impressed with the almost unlimited expenditures upon clothing. The sums now spent from year to year upon buildings and houses are of fabulous extent. In all the great cities of the world unprecedented numbers of costly buildings and houses have been, and are being, erected. Nor are the expenditures confined to cities of the first rank. In all the important towns of the world, expensive buildings and houses are rapidly increasing in number. Moreover, large sums are being spent upon what are termed city improvements, designed to raise the standards of comfort, of health, and of aesthetic enjoyment. In a recent visit to the United States I derived special pleasure from the parks, either actual or contemplated, which have been or are to be laid out at great expense in the suburbs of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Chicago, and other cities. The improvement in the housing of the masses of the people, both of this and of other countries, is equally marked. Our forefathers would have regarded a constant supply of pure water and baths for labouring men as extravagant superfluities; yet we are rapidly approaching the time when the working men of the civilised world will enjoy these luxuries, and when the morning bath will be a ceremony as sacred as the morning meal.

The intellectual advantages and amusements of modern life have shown equal advancement. Education is universal, except in the dark countries. Children are now but rarely called upon to contribute to the family purse at the early age at which they used to seek employment, and the average age at which children now leave school is steadily rising. Moreover, the education, instruction, and amusement of everyone in the past generation or two by the circulation of newspapers, magazines, and books is nothing short of a revolution. Never did the average man and woman advance in knowledge and intellectual attainments as in modern times, and the annual cost of supplying the world with literature has risen by leaps and bounds. The declining tendency of the death-rate shows, I think, conclusively the great attention now paid and the large sums now devoted to medical nursing and sanitary science, although it is also due to the general advance in intellectual, moral, and physical standards which has

come with the improvement in the conditions of existence rendered possible by the enormous growth in the world's wealth.

It is obvious that all this additional expenditure upon defence, upon recreation, upon travel, upon ornamentation, upon clothing, upon housing, upon education, upon literature, and upon the preservation of health, could only have been effected concurrently with a vastly increased expenditure upon food. Indeed, the immensely greater sums available for the purchase of food, and the vast increase in the supply of food, have alone rendered possible the liberal expenditures upon necessities, comforts, and luxuries to which I have referred. Never has the world enjoyed as much food in proportion to its population as it has secured in modern times, and, consequently, never has the world been as healthy, as well clothed and housed, had greater warmth in winter, had as many intellectual advantages, possessed as many comforts, and enjoyed so high a state of luxury as it does to-day. In fact, *la joie de vivre* has rapidly broadened and deepened, and all ranks, classes, and sections of society in the new and in the old countries, in the backward as well as in the progressive state, in the brown, yellow, and black races as well as in the white, have attained a degree of wealth and prosperity immeasurably higher and greater than anything that has hitherto been witnessed.

The causes of the great revolution in the material, moral, and intellectual condition of the world in modern times have been many, but there can be no doubt that the wonderful progress we have witnessed has been mainly brought about by wider knowledge and sounder principles of social welfare than were formerly held; principles which, when they gain still wider acceptance, cannot fail to bring a degree of prosperity to the race which will surpass anything that is now dreamt of. Over the past century and a half the world has become increasingly conscious of the fact that individuals and nations in seeking to grow wealthy at the expense of other individuals and nations were retarding progress and creating poverty, and that a nation's prosperity is enhanced, not diminished, by the prosperity of other countries.

Throughout the ages this knowledge has been slowly gaining acceptance. The spread of population speaking the same language, holding the same religion, and having many interests in common, brought with it the interdependence of families, of villages, and of districts, until finally the inhabitants of whole countries came to recognise the solidarity of their interests, and to look upon the welfare of the state as the matter of the highest

importance, which must be protected at all costs and at any sacrifice. But while it was recognised that the welfare of the individual was governed by the welfare of other individuals in the same village, town, or state, the prosperity of the inhabitants of other lands was regarded with envy and distrust, and the progress of other states was looked upon with suspicious jealousy. In modern times there has been a great change in the relations of individual with individual, and of state with state. The hatred of the foreigner has largely disappeared, and there has been a growing appreciation of the fact that not only is the prosperity of individuals bound up with that of other individuals, towns with towns, and districts with districts, but that the prosperity of states is dependent upon the well-being of the other states of the world.

In brief, the world is fast approaching economic maturity and to that high condition of well-being which cannot fail to result from fuller knowledge, and from the elimination of the physical and mental barriers which have so greatly impeded progress in the past. When families ceased to preserve a self-contained existence, and the economic unit became the district, the human race left behind its swaddling clothes, and there was a great advance in social well-being. Again, when the state instead of the district became the economic unit, the race entered upon its adolescence, and mankind rose to a still higher level of material well-being. In modern times the whole world has been rapidly taking the place of the state as the economic unit, and although the process is far from complete, the advantages already gained from the removal of the physical barriers—and some of the economic ones, too—which divided continent from continent, and country from country, are so remarkable that, as the work advances and the nations more fully recognise the solidarity of their interests, the world can look forward to a degree of well-being for the race far beyond the dreams of the dreamer.

Greater knowledge and the wider principles of social welfare brought with them inventions of the most remarkable character. The closer intercourse of district with district, and country with country, which came with greater knowledge, opened up new markets and created new needs; and to supply these larger needs machinery was invented, by means of which the efficiency of labour was increased manyfold. Probably the invention which had the greatest influence upon progress was the application of steam to transport. This invention almost annihilated the great distances

which, up to the middle of the nineteenth century, separated district from district and country from country, and has brought all the districts of the world into close communication with each other.

Another important cause of the great progress of modern times was the need of the Western countries of Europe to supplement their own supplies of food and raw materials by imports from other lands, and the knowledge that these essentials could be obtained in abundance by developing the fertile districts and the natural wealth of the new countries.

A third influence of great moment was the development of banking, by means of which the aggregated savings of large numbers of persons were made available for works of utility. Until the seventeenth century banking was almost unknown, and it was not until the nineteenth century that the public possessed the education and knowledge to induce them to employ their growing savings to any appreciable extent wherever they could be profitably used, both in their own country and in other lands. At all times thrifty persons have existed—persons desirous of adding to their wealth either for their own enjoyment or for the benefit of their families; but until comparatively recent times, these savings were almost entirely confined to expenditures by individuals upon their own estates, houses, farms, or businesses, to the ornamentation of their houses or persons, or to hoardings of specie; and the growth of wealth was limited by the relatively few inducements and few opportunities which then existed for the mass of mankind to make provision for their future by keeping their consumption beneath their income and by devoting their surplus labour or surplus income to works designed to increase their own consuming power. The introduction of banking and the increasing opportunities of profitable employment for savings greatly stimulated the desire to save, and caused the annual amount of wealth available for the construction of productive works to grow by leaps and bounds. The combined effect of these three factors upon the progress of the world cannot be exaggerated.

Education and invention wonderfully increased the efficiency of labour, and made it possible for the labourer to obtain access to the natural wealth of the whole world, wherever it could be found; the needs of the Western countries of Europe made them anxious to supplement their own supplies of food and materials, and rendered them willing to employ labour and capital in the development of the natural resources of other lands, while the

growth of banking and the great expansion of savings which resulted created the large supply of capital necessary for the construction of the means of transport and the provision of all the other machinery required to create, to distribute, and to manufacture for consumption the additional supplies of natural wealth.

During the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, Great Britain supplied small amounts of capital to her colonies and to India for developing their resources, and these investments taught the British people to appreciate the value and profitability of placing their savings in other lands, when by so doing they could obtain the raw materials they needed for their manufactures and the tropical luxuries they required for their consumption; but it was not until the nineteenth century forced the British people to look abroad, not only for many of the raw materials they required for their manufactures, but for a large portion of their food supplies, that the amount of British savings supplied to other countries reached large proportions. In less than three generations, railways have been constructed in nearly every country of the world, and a very large portion of the capital that was necessary for the purpose has been supplied out of their savings by the inhabitants of these islands. After building railways for themselves, the British people built railways for the Continent, for the United States, for Canada, for Mexico, for the whole of South America, for Australasia, for India, and for other countries; and are now engaged in building railways on a great scale in various parts of the world, and more especially in Canada and in Argentina. For their own use, and for the use of colonial, Indian, and foreign countries, the British people have supplied upwards of three thousand millions of capital for railway construction in a little over seventy years—the greatest work that any nation has ever accomplished, and a work that has brought greater material welfare to the world than any deed which preceded it, or is likely to be accomplished in future. But Great Britain has done more for mankind than merely providing the means of communication over land and sea. She has also provided other countries with great amounts of her savings for the development of their natural resources. The immense increase in the production of foodstuffs, of wool, of cotton, of tobacco, of tea, of rubber, and of other agricultural produce in the various countries of the world has been largely due to the capital supplied to farmers, ranchers, and planters by the British people; and the vast expansion in the production of minerals of all kinds and descriptions

from the precious metals to iron ore, coal, and oil has been mainly brought about by the great sums placed by Great Britain at the service of labour in every land. Indeed, to describe fully the beneficial work performed by the skill, self-denial, and enterprise of the British people in creating inventions and supplying the capital and labour which have so powerfully contributed to the prosperity of mankind would need not a paper but a volume.

The effect of these inventions and of these capital investments on the social well-being has been very great. The welfare of the individual is governed by the amount of wealth annually produced in proportion to population: the greater the production the greater the amount available for consumption per head, and all inventions and all capital expenditures upon improving the machinery of production, tend to increase the comfort and happiness of everyone. Mr. Bowley and Mr. Wood have calculated that the real spending power of the wage-earners of Great Britain per head has doubled in the last sixty years, notwithstanding the growth of population—a remarkable result when the limited natural resources of these islands in proportion to their population is considered. But the effect upon the welfare of Great Britain is but a small part of the advantages which have come from the inventiveness, enterprise, and thrift of the British people. By means of the shipping, the railways, and the banking and other facilities provided mainly by England, tens of millions of persons have been enabled to escape from poverty and want in the older countries to affluence in the new, and great nations have been created which enjoy a high standard of comfort and luxury. The great and wealthy American Republic, the population of which has grown in a little over a century from 5,000,000 to 92,000,000 of persons will, I am sure, be the first to acknowledge that her present prosperity and population could not have been attained but for the vast quantities of capital supplied by Great Britain for railway construction and for other purposes, and by the immense purchases of her products by the British people. And the growth in the population and in the welfare of the many millions of persons in all the young countries, is equally traceable to the wise policy of this country. Nor are the advantages confined to the young countries. It would be impossible for Europe to maintain her great populations in the degree of comfort they now enjoy had not the means been found for increasing the world's supplies of food and raw materials in the manner they have been increased by the aid of British capital. It is true that in the

past generation France and Germany have largely shared in the work of supplying the world with the capital it needs for the development of its supplies of natural products, and that this participation has increased the rate of progress; but the amount of capital which Great Britain has supplied to colonial and foreign countries is as great as the total sum supplied by the whole of the other countries of the world for use beyond their borders, and it is upon the great investments of the British people in other lands that the world mainly depends for the new supplies of capital required to open up additional land to cultivation and to increase the supplies of minerals and other raw products. Furthermore, the condition of the ancient and populous nations of the East is being steadily raised by means of the railways and other works, the construction of which has been rendered possible by the savings and enterprise of the British nation. The phenomenal increase in the prosperity of Egypt since its occupation by England caused British capital to flow in freely for railway construction, for irrigation, for banking, for mining, and for other purposes, is known to everyone. The welfare of the people of India has also immensely improved in the last two generations, and the great sums that have been supplied to India by this country for railways, irrigation, and other purposes have not only diminished the effects of intermittent drought upon the districts suffering from famine by bringing supplies of food from other districts, but they have so increased the wealth production of the country that we can now look forward to the time when the failure of the monsoon will cease to have the disastrous consequences it had in former days. The work of supplying the great Chinese Empire with the railways needed to connect its giant provinces one with the other is now proceeding, and the day is not distant when the population of China will no longer be decimated by the great famines which visit them in consequence of the lack of an efficient system of transport. In brief, not only has the social condition of this country been raised to a high level by means of the inventions of the British people, coupled with the savings which permitted those inventions to be introduced, but the social condition of the whole world has been placed upon a level the height of which can only be realised by those who are old enough to recollect the conditions that prevailed before the savings of this country were placed at the service of other lands.

The outlook for the future seems to be a very bright one. Never was the world more inventive, never was the spirit of enter-

prise more apparent, and never were the savings of the world on a greater scale in proportion to population than they are to-day. Look where we will, there is progress, and Great Britain appears to be more progressive than ever. Never have the British people paid greater attention to the education of their children and young people upon whose efficiency the future depends; never have they devoted so much thought to invention and to the introduction of more economical methods of production and of distribution; never were their annual savings greater than they are to-day, and never were they more careful to employ their savings in promoting enterprises which will create the wealth essential to the maintenance of the world's growing population.

It is now generally recognised that money spent upon education is a reproductive outlay, and that in the hands of the efficient a given amount of capital will yield a much larger quantity of wealth; hence the proposals to extend the school age, and to equip the youth of this country as well as of other countries with an industrial training, cannot fail to cause wealth to grow more rapidly in proportion to population than it has grown in the past. Everyone who realises the revolution that has been going on all over the world in methods of transportation, by means of which produce and manufactures are now carried with incredible economy from district to district, and from country to country, is aware that a smaller proportion of the world's growing savings will be needed to provide the machinery of transportation, and that a larger proportion will be available for increasing the world's productions. Furthermore, everyone acquainted with the progress of farming, of mining, and of manufactures in recent years is aware of the great economies that have been effected, and of the increasing output in proportion to the labour employed. Thus we have the fact that the efficiency of labour is rapidly increasing, that it is likely to increase, and that a larger amount of capital will everywhere be available for the use of labour, and we cannot doubt that this combination will cause the production of wealth to increase much more rapidly in proportion than population, and that the social welfare of the whole world will rise to a much higher level than it has yet attained.

Before concluding my survey of the future, I ought to make three provisos. There can be no doubt that the world will attain to a much greater degree of prosperity than it has yet enjoyed if peace is maintained, and the enormous waste of wealth which would result from its disturbance in the twentieth century is

avoided. A great war would absorb the capital, which would otherwise be devoted to the work of increasing the world's production of wealth, would cause production to grow more slowly than population, and would do serious injury not only to the countries that were engaged in the conflict, but to every other country in the world.

The second proviso is that wealth will grow more rapidly in proportion to population if the new inventions and the increase in efficiency continues to bring with them corresponding advantages to labour; that is an advance in the rate of real wages in proportion to the increase in production per head. It is necessary to recollect that two things are essential to progress, increased supply coupled with an increased demand, and that neither can be checked without disaster. The advances in the rates of both nominal and of real wages that have been in progress all over the world in modern times have been as conducive to prosperity as the immense increase in production, and unless the rate of real wages continues to advance with the increase of production in proportion to population, it will be impossible for the world to consume the additional wealth that will be created, and progress will be checked.

The third proviso is that it is essential for wage-earners to recollect that an increase in the rate of real wages cannot take place unless labour is more efficient than hitherto, and unless the production of wealth per head of population continues to expand. Were labour to imagine that it could increase its rate of consumption without increasing its rate of production, then the supply of new capital available for increasing production would be curtailed, there would be no expansion in the quantity of wealth available for consumption in proportion to population, and there would be no advance in the social well-being.

But I do not apprehend that any of these disasters will occur. Indeed, one of the results of the great progress in education and knowledge seems to be a juster appreciation of the injury to everyone caused by war, of the advantages of meeting the rightful claims of labour to a full share of the increase of wealth, and of the necessity and benefit to everyone of creating new savings from year to year sufficient to provide the vast amount of capital now required for the maintenance of the world's growing population in an advancing state of comfort. Indeed I anticipate that the continued advance in the rate of real wages will enable the wage earning classes to save much more largely than hitherto and to

contribute in a greater measure to the savings annually available for productive works. Hence I look for the supply of capital to grow more rapidly and to bring yet greater advances to the whole of mankind in general and to the wage earning classes in particular.

Thus not only can we look back to the great progress of the world in the past century with feelings of thankfulness to those whose inventions, whose sacrifices, and whose policy have brought us to our existing relatively high state of comfort, but we can look into the future in the confident anticipation that nothing can prevent the nations from working in closer sympathy and co-operation as the years pass, and that the effect of the unity of mankind will be a degree of well-being beyond the hopes of the most sanguine.

GEORGE PAISH.

DISCUSSION.

MR. A. C. COLE.

THE CHAIRMAN said it was not perhaps inappropriate that a representative of the banking community should preside on such an occasion, for while bankers were not primarily the creators of wealth, the development of banking, as Mr. Paish pointed out, had been the great means, not only of assisting the accumulation of capital, but also of directing its employment in profitable fields of investment. This country in the first half of the last century developed its banking institutions faster than our neighbours and competitors had done, and our commercial relations all over the world gave us opportunities for investments of which we took, and were still taking, great advantage. Our capitalists have no doubt made their investments primarily for their own benefit, but Mr. Paish had admirably brought out in his paper the fact that the investments of English people abroad had materially benefited the whole world. He had been interested in hearing what Mr. Paish said in regard to the three provisos for the future. First, while peace was a good asset, they must be careful not to cultivate a dread of war. Mr. Paish had shown that the whole world had been so reduced in size that the nations were practically all neighbours. The uncivilised nations were increasing at a far greater rate than the civilised, and the latter must never give up, for the sake of a comfortable or luxurious feeling, the consideration that they may have to fight for their very existence. As regarded the second proviso, Mr. Paish said that two things were essential to progress—an increased supply coupled with an increased demand. That raised what had always seemed to him the unsolved and unsolvable problem of political economy, viz., the drawing of a definite line between beneficial saving and beneficial expenditure. If they were all misers there would be no progress; equally, if they were all spendthrifts there would be no accumulation of capital and again, no progress. On this point, he doubted whether it was

possible to get beyond the old maxim that virtue was an elective habit, consisting in the mean. Regarding the third proviso, he thought the need for efficiency of labour should be kept prominently before the trade unions. Unless labour were made more efficient, they could not look for the progress to which they were entitled, and the real trouble at the moment was that men were inclined to say they would do only so much work in a given time; in other words, production was going to be more expensive. He was glad Mr. Paish had raised the point, because it was essential to the well-being of the country that it should not be lost sight of.

MR. L. G. CHIOZZA MONEY, M.P.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY said: We are, I think, much indebted to Mr. Paish for bringing before us a subject in which so many phases of the great question of poverty are involved. If I have any complaint to make with regard to the contents of the paper, it is that it has perhaps been couched in a too optimistic vein. But the world is always badly in need of optimism, and in the long run it will, I hope, be found that I also am an optimist. At the same time, if optimism is to be well founded, we ought to take account of all the facts of the situation, and the situation to be considered in connection with the subject matter before us is very complex indeed. I could not refrain from asking myself as I listened to Mr. Paish: "Who have the savings?" That is a very important question, for it is obvious that those who have the savings must draw the interest attaching to the savings. I fear it will be found on examination that the savings of the great masses of the people, while they amount to a large figure actually, are yet small relatively to the total savings of the nation. In fact, the savings of the masses amount to such a mere fraction of the capital of the country that if they were entirely dissipated and lost at this moment the country would be practically as rich as before. One looks at those hundreds of millions of figures in the Registrar-General's returns which are a summary of the greater part of the savings of the people—investments in building societies, provident societies, and so on—and the total sum, in relation to the total capital of the country, is almost negligible. The truth is, that interest is almost entirely drawn by a very small class of the community, and that there is a very great ill-distribution of wealth in the country. The greater part of the people have only their labour to sell, and they have to sell it to a small class which owns the means of production. When we come to inquire into the nature of the savings of the masses, what do we find? What is their nature? They resemble in kind the squirrel's store of nuts. They are not industrial capital. The savings of the poor consist almost entirely of little houses, sometimes very inferior in character, of small sums put by for a rainy day. They are not sums invested in industry. Now let us ask what becomes of the large savings of the upper classes of the community—the bulk, that is of the nation's savings. I think it my duty to point out to you that in recent years a too large part of

our savings has gone over the seas. An eminent person recently coined a phrase: "Trade follows the loan." I will tell you something else that follows the loan: *men* follow the loan. It may be a great source of pride to us to think that we are developing the wild places of the earth, causing to be fruitful plains untouched by man; it may be a source of pride that trees are being cut down under whose shade we have never walked, that we are causing to be developed mines of whose situation we have only the most obscure notion; it may be good, it is good for the world undoubtedly; but what about our own people? Is there a sufficiency of capital being put out in the interests of these islands? I doubt whether there is. Take the Housing question. What is the Housing question? It is one of capital. Some people think the Housing question is a question of land; no doubt it is, but it is much more a question of capital. Enough British capital is not being put into the Housing question; our cities of to-day are not attractive living places. It is considerations of this kind which should make us ask ourselves where we should draw the line between the development of the waste places of the earth and the development of our own country. And we ought to ask ourselves whether we are giving ample opportunities to the 45 or 46 millions of people which inhabit these islands. No one can have failed to notice the recrudescence of emigration. I do not lose sight of the fact that this emigration has been largely stimulated by methods never before exerted. We all know that colonial governments have set up attractive offices in order to draw people out of this country. If the process is to go on, and rich people continue to send their savings abroad, I warn you that the best of your life-blood will also go abroad. I hope the Scotch Census will wake the people up to what is going on.

To proceed. Another thing of moment arises from the ill-distribution of wealth: you get a lack of driving power to develop all your trades for home purposes. That is a point I am very glad that Mr. Paish dealt with in his very admirable paper. It is a most important point. Mr. Paish referred to Mr. Rowntree and his poverty line. You will remember that Mr. Rowntree sketched for us the economic man who went to the co-operative stores and bought at the lowest possible prices, avoiding butcher's meat and such luxuries; and he told us that this wonderful creature and his family could be sustained in efficiency at 21s. 8d. per week. That was in the year 1899. What has happened in the interval? Prices have gone up 10 per cent. since 1899, and Mr. Rowntree's economic man must spend to-day 23s. or 24s. in order to secure a minimum of physical efficiency. His poverty line took account of only 4s. as the rent to be paid; but what is 4s. for rent in London, in Manchester, in Leeds? A poor family would need to pay 6s. or 8s. in London for rent in order to secure—I won't say a home, I hesitate to say a resting place—but at all events, some sort of foothold, some shelter, more or less insanitary. Out of this 21s. 8d., or out of the 23s. or 24s. of to-day, what has the man to spend on clothing, furnishing, and so forth? It is a mere shilling or so. If they need something in the way of furniture, they have to resort to the hire-purchase system, and to purchase one or two

sticks which it would be a libel to call furniture. If they are to buy household utensils they must be cheap and miserable products. If they are to purchase clothes they must be mere shoddy, and if they are to have anything in the way of decoration they must be trinkets of the cheapest and most garish kind. In these circumstances, how are your trades to be developed productively for home account? Judged by the figures I have given, the great masses of the people are really poorer than they were ten or fifteen years ago, and as a consequence trades cannot expand for home account. You are reaching out for a large export trade, but what of the trade which lies immediately at your doors? And what of the trade that might be, the trade which would satisfy the home hunger for boots and clothes and decent houses? You cannot get the trade because of the insufficiency of wages. Mr. Paish is right, entirely right, when he says that real wages have expanded; but real wages have not expanded in this country in the last ten or fifteen years, when you take into account the rise in prices. In the last ten years the wages in a group of industrial trades which have been investigated have risen about 1 per cent.—an almost negligible quantity. But food has risen 10 per cent.: therefore the British workman is really worse off. It is not good for him, it is not good for industry, it is not good for the nation.

I now pass to what has happened to the product of labour. We find from the income-tax returns that there has been a handsome increase—a very handsome increase—in profits. The increase is almost startling; it amounts to hundreds of millions during the past fifteen years. It is not a good thing for the country that simultaneously with the fall in real wages received by the masses of the people, there should be, on the other hand, a vastly increased profit drawn by the few people who possess the capital and land, because it means the unhealthy development of your industries. There are one or two more points upon which I should like to say a word. One is the disadvantage attaching to individual investments, because the investment of the individual is sometimes a hindrance to society as a whole. Perhaps I can best illustrate my meaning by referring to the slow progress which electricity has made in this country, chiefly through vested interests. There are the gas corporations, and the municipal undertakings which control gas undertakings, and so forth. Again, workmen have in many cases been induced to purchase small and badly-built houses. Because a man has this poor investment, he acts as a bar to progress of a most serious kind. Such houses are an obstacle to dealing with the Housing question on a large and comprehensive scale. In this way I am afraid rich and poor individual investments alike sometimes stand in the way of the advantage of the community as a whole. That is one reason why in these latter days the problems we are considering become more and more serious. I can more easily suggest the nature of the evil than I can point out the cure, and this is the case with so many phases of Sociology. Finally, the question of the efficiency of labour must be touched upon. It is certainly true that we want more efficiency in production, and I do not think that we can get efficiency in production until we have a higher standard of education. We of the 20th century

are the inheritors of all the ages; and yet, in how many cases does the child in these days take up the heritage that is his? Not one child in a hundred takes up in any serious way that which is the heritage of us all. We are surrounded by industrial miracles which we do not understand. We have to ensure that every boy and girl should gain a full knowledge of his relationship to nature, so that the mass of our people may understand what might be done with the forces that lie at their disposal. Our greatest need is concentration upon a better standard of training for the citizens of our country. We want the people to understand how wealth is made and how wealth is distributed, and when we have taken that step we have taken the chief step towards the solution of the problem of poverty, one phase of which Mr. Paish has so interestingly raised.

The RT. HON. SIR THOMAS WHITTAKER, M.P.

SIR THOMAS WHITTAKER said he ventured to think that Mr. Chiozza Money, in the midst of many wise things, had enunciated a few fallacies. The figures with regard to the poverty line would bear a great deal of revision. If they went to some of the small manufacturing towns of the North and ascertained the facts from the people themselves, they would come to the conclusion that it was nonsense to talk about one-third of the people there being in a state of poverty fixed by such a line. He thought also that some qualifications were needed as to the decrease in real wages. It was difficult to get at the facts as a whole. To-day, far fewer people were working in agriculture and the lower-wages-earning trades than were working a few years ago, and a larger proportion in the higher-wages-earning trades. That was an important factor. As to the increase in the revenue from income tax, it must be remembered that a great deal many more people were now paying income tax. With regard to investments abroad, he did not think it was always true, to the extent indicated by Mr. Money, that the man followed the loan. They had lent a large amount of money to Argentina, but not a great many English had followed it out there. Investments abroad created customers, who employed people here. By opening up great territories abroad, by the construction of railways and other undertakings, people were enabled to produce crops and goods, which led to the purchase of the goods of this country, and thus to the maintenance of a large number of people. He did not think progress in housing was retarded by the lack of capital. Where houses were wanted and not built it was chiefly because the people would not or could not pay a rent which would give a return on the capital investment. Many mechanics in the North of England, for example, some with families earning £4 to £6 a week, were content to live in houses at 3/6 and 4/- a week. They ought to spend more on their houses, but many of them would not. The Chairman had said that if they were all misers there would be no progress. But he would point out that usually the money saved by the penurious was invested and expended; unless such

money were put in the proverbial stocking, or locked up in the cupboard, it must make for progress. The miser took care to get more money; he had that much sagacity. His desire to increase his hoard would lead him to invest, or deposit in a bank, and therefore other people would spend the money and progress would come in that way. There could be saving which would be really the greatest waste, and there could be expenditure which would manifest the truest thrift. All depended on the character of the saving and the character of the expenditure. The masses of the people were not worse off than they had been. The existing discontent was one of the results of the progress recorded by Mr. Paish. They had created greater needs, greater aspirations, greater requirements. People needed more, desired more, and intended to have more, because they saw what was possible. They had opened their eyes, and widened their outlook. He thought the keynote of the subject had been struck by Mr. Paish when he dwelt upon the need for efficiency and capacity. Only by having an efficient people could they keep pace with civilisation and hold the ground they had gained. The great development of capacity which had brought Japan to the forefront in the last thirty years had, as Mr. Paish indicated, been a blessing to the whole world. Any money spent in developing the capacities of the people was money well-spent; it was capacity that created customers, both at home and abroad. He agreed with Mr. Chiozza Money that it was necessary for the people to have higher real wages. Higher wages were a great boon: but in order to secure them, the people must be capable, efficient, and industrious.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

THE RIGHT HON. F. HUTH JACKSON, President of the
Institute of Bankers.

THE Right Hon. F. HUTH JACKSON, who was to have presided at the meeting but was prevented from being present, supplied the following comment on the paper in the form of a letter to Mr. Paish:—

Your description of the advance in wealth and prosperity of the civilised world during the last sixty years is most interesting and instructive, and the conclusions you come to, that the greater portion of this advance has been due to the vast quantities of capital supplied by Great Britain, must, I feel sure, be gratifying to our national pride. I agree with you that the prospects for further advance are favourable, subject to the proviso that the capital expended continues to be reproductive. As regards armaments, in which so much capital has in recent years been sunk, such money may in a sense be considered reproductive so long as it ensures a continuance of peace. As regards capital invested in enterprises, the limits for such investments of a profitable character have by no means yet been reached. Indeed, it may perhaps be said that future investments are likely to prove even more remunerative than those of the past, owing to the great advance in

recent years in the economy of production, which has resulted in a given amount of capital yielding far better results than the same amount of capital would have yielded fifty years ago.

As regards money spent on the betterment of the working classes, there is still, of course, plenty of room for further reproductive investment of capital. But, as you rightly observe, it is in this direction that danger lies, because, after a certain point is reached further investment of capital in the betterment of the surroundings of the working classes must to a great extent be experimental, and, so far as the experiment fails, will perhaps be attended with far-reaching results.

I myself am not afraid of Socialism as far as this country is concerned, but I am not certain that the working classes will continue to appreciate the value of the increased leisure which the shortening of the day's work has brought to them. There is, I fear, an increasing tendency amongst the working classes to feel that these leisure hours can be usefully spent in attending football matches and race meetings, instead of being spent in self-improvement or rest. This tendency leads to increased extravagance, which I think is mainly the reason for the feeling amongst many working men that the main object they must keep in view is to obtain as much money as they can, and give as little additional work and intelligence as possible for the increased wage. They fail to appreciate the value of the increased leisure because they have not yet realised how properly to make use of it. Still, the risk of this investment is one, I think, which we are justified in running, as there is good reason for hoping that with the advance of education the working men of this country, and of other countries, will learn to appreciate the fundamental fact that their labour can only continue to command high wages as part of the mechanism of production as long as it continues to be effective.

F. H. J.

Mr. J. A. HOBSON.

THERE are several points in Mr. Paish's stimulating survey of modern methods of economic progress that call for comment. No one can question the important part played by modern methods of investment in developing the wealth of the world. But there are certain wastes in the capitalist process which he ignores. New savings, taking shape in productive instruments slightly superior to those hitherto in operation, often displace or cancel the latter in a socially wasteful manner. It is of course socially useful that improvements, however slight, shall be utilised without unreasonable delay. But competitive capitalism, in which the profits of individuals determine the pace of change, regardless of the losses of other individuals, involves great net wastes of capital. A proper computation of the social gain of these improvements demands that this premature death of former savings, invested in capital now competitively displaced, shall be taken into account. It is socially advantageous that changes of industrial structure shall be gradual, both as regards capital and labour. But private capitalism makes for rapid structural changes, regardless of the plant and labour (belonging to others)

that is displaced. So progress is got at an excessive cost of dislocation.

Rejoicing over the growth of capital, Mr. Paish attributes to it such part of that doubling of real wages, which he holds to have occurred in recent times, as is not attributable to increased efficiency of labour. He does not, however, discuss the stoppage of this growth of real wages which appears to have taken place during the last fifteen years in Great Britain and the United States, the two countries where capital has been increasing most rapidly, and where labour is, upon the whole, continually advancing in efficiency.

His somewhat excessive optimism as regards the popular welfare seems based upon the conviction that the gains of savings must pass chiefly to the workers in rising wages. But how if they are retained mainly in the form of rents, surplus profits, high interests or high payment for managerial services? Mr. Paish seems to assume a larger amount of free and keen competition among the owners of land, capital and industrial ability, than actually exists. For over large areas of industry, combinations, more or less tight, have displaced or greatly modified competition, enabling the capital and business ability therein employed to reap gains far in excess of what is economically necessary to evoke the use of sufficient quantities of these factors of production. The monopoly or scarcity gains thus obtained prevent the wages of the workers rising as they would rise were Mr. Paish's hypothesis quite correct.

He does not appear to admit the existence of any such unearned surplus, which, by improved organisation and methods of bargaining labour, can be converted into higher wages. For he expressly argues that "an increase in the rate of real wages cannot take place unless labour is more efficient than hitherto." Now I hold that, irrespective of increased efficiency, it is possible, theoretically and even practically, for wages to rise by encroaching upon rents and other surplus payments of the other factors, *i.e.*, labour can obtain an increased *proportion* of the product, and is not confined in its rise of wages to the same proportion of an increased product due to its improved productivity. In supposing that such an encroachment of wages upon rents and profits would check the growth of capital and so of future wealth, Mr Paish assumes that all the surplus thus diverted into wages would have been saved, not spent. I suggest that if all the income spent by the rich in luxuries could, by organised pressure, be added to wages, to be expended in raising the standard of life and efficiency of the workers, the productive power of the nation would be enhanced and the output of wealth increased.

J. A. H.

MR. A. L. BOWLEY.

MR. BOWLEY sends us the following note on the relative growth of "earned" and "unearned" income in the United Kingdom since 1860:—

Mr. Paish's valuable discussion on the effect of savings suggests as a natural corollary the question as to what reward is obtained

by the owners of the capital accumulated. In what follows I propose to deal only with broad results. The data are drawn principally from the papers noted below.* The analysis teems with statistical difficulties and no exact result can be obtained. The phrase "unearned" income is used in a conventional sense to denote income arising from rent, interest, and profits from the use of capital; the definition is kept unchanged, so far as is possible, throughout the period. As to wages we depend on current estimates of the annual national wage-bill, carried back by wage index-numbers for 50 years, and as to income on the reports of the Commissioners of Income assessed to tax. In addition to these two main categories there is the group of small salaries (of clerks, teachers, shop-assistants and others) and small earnings or profits (of farmers, young professionals etc.) which is estimated to amount to nearly £300,000,000 now, and not improbably was about £100,000,000 in 1860. The whole change in 45 years is exhibited in the following table:—

	1860.	1906.
Unearned Income	£200,000,000	550,000,000
Earned: above exemption limit.....	£100,000,000	350,000,000
(other than wages) below exemption limit	£100,000,000	300,000,000
Wages	£300,000,000	700,000,000
Total National Income	£700,000,000	1900,000,000

The estimate of the Total National Income in 1906, here meaning the aggregate of the incomes of individuals as ordinarily reckoned, is rather higher than in the papers referred to, for the amount in small salaries, etc., proves to be more considerable than was expected. Unearned income then appears to have been just under 30 per cent. of the total (28·6 in 1860, 28·95 in 1906) both at the beginning and end of this period. It is not possible to separate economic rent completely from the returns to capital, since the annual value of houses includes the sites they stand on; but enough is known to show that the total return to capital owned by inhabitants of the United Kingdom was nearly the same fraction of national income in 1860 and in 1905.

This is a very remarkable result. Capital has increased very much more rapidly than population; but the annual payment for its use remains only the same proportion of the value produced by the joint action of land, capital, and labour. As regards home production it seems probable that the proportion has decreased, since the "unearned" income includes a rapidly increasing aggre-

* *Statistical Journal*, 1895: "Changes in Average Wages in the United Kingdom"; and subsequent articles, 1898 to 1910, on Wages and on the Progress of the Working Classes, by the present writer or Mr. G. H. Wood

Economic Journal, 1904: "Tests of National Progress."

Report of the Committee of the British Association on "... Income other than Wages below the Income-Tax Exemption Limit ..." 1910.

gate of profits and interests from abroad. This proportion has changed little year by year throughout the period. From 1860 to 1872 earnings gained a little, rising from 71 to perhaps 75% of the total; from 1872 to 1884 earnings lost, returning to about 71%; from 1884 to 1906 there is little visible change in the proportion. On more minute examination, of the period 1887 to 1910, it appears that *wages* gained in proportion from 1886 to 1892 and lost this gain between 1898 and 1902. It seems probable that a slight further loss has taken place since 1906, but the Income statistics are not complete.

The whole of the foregoing refers of course to money income and wages only, and to proportions of the aggregate not to the receipts of the individual.

A. L. B.

PROFESSOR S. J. CHAPMAN (University of Manchester).

I HAVE read Mr. Paish's paper with great interest. I share his optimism as to the results to be expected from increased saving. There are one or two points arising out of the paper to which I may advert.

In the future the rate of interest may be expected to fall. It will probably fall for three reasons. The first is that more capital will tend to be saved as the community gets wealthier. Another is that a greater *proportion* of income will be saved as people more fully realise the future, learn providence and contract increasingly the habit of saving. As regards this reason, it is not impossible that legislation which in effect insists on insurance, of which impressive examples have been afforded of late in Germany and this country, may actually aid in ingraining the habit of saving. This, of course, is not certain. There are authorities who argue that the more the State is provident for people the less will they be provident for themselves. But there are other authorities who argue that if you make people act as if they were provident and plant them in an environment of insurance, the motive to be provident will be created. Which school of social psychology has the truth of the matter, remains to be seen.

My third reason for saying that a fall of interest is probable is that inventions in the future are not unlikely to simplify the productive process—to simplify it in the sense that they will cut out links from the roundabout process involved in the use of capital. In the initial stages inventions must make production more roundabout. In later stages they may make it less roundabout. The loom exemplifies the first type of invention; and improvement of the loom which makes it cheaper and more productive, the second. If future inventions are going to have the effect to a large extent of perfecting methods of production the marginal value of capital will tend to fall though its total value will be enhanced. A fall in the rate of interest if brought about in any of these ways, will be an immense boon to the community. It will mean higher remuneration for all kinds of working.

S. J. C.

PROFESSOR E. C. K. GONNER (University of Liverpool).

Mr. Paish has very rightly insisted on Savings as one of the important influences in modern social progress. The reasons for this are many and merit very careful consideration. Among them three stand out prominently.

In the first place, as is truly said, the mobility of the capital which is the result of saving has tended to that inter-relation between nations which provides the necessary protection for the common impulse which is as yet too weak to constitute an effective social bond between various communities and peoples. Common interest even of a material nature is a necessary stage in the development of common sympathy.

In the second place, the provision made by savings is of peculiar importance from a purely sociological point of view. Just as one weakness in early societies is the lack of any sense of community between the various individuals existing together, so another is the absence of any sense of continuity between successive generations. Hence a true realisation of society implies continuity, and without adequate provision continuity is obscured. Quite apart from the material welfare of individuals, provision for the future and release from the risks and dangers which it comprises are conditions of a sound social conception.

In the third place, the effect of security upon the efficiency of labour must not be overlooked. At one time saving was looked at almost entirely with reference to its result on the provision of capital. No doubt writers like Mill, at any rate in his early years, were impressed by the needs of a particular time when with expanding manufactures and with a chasm between savings and their employment in industry and trade, capital loomed large as the great want. It was owing to this that we have the insistence on a truth which was a partial truth, namely the limitation of industry by capital. But side by side with this must be placed the other truth, the limitation of industry by the efficiency of labour. An analysis of the causes determining efficiency exhibits provision for the future and against the contingencies embodied in it as one and by no means the least important. It would be difficult to overestimate the loss and demoralisation occasioned by its absence. Security of this kind may be ranked with organisation and the division of labour as an essential condition of the effective working of the various productive agents. As the eighteenth century marks the development of the one so the nineteenth century marks the development of the other. While the various ways in which it shows itself and its consequences cannot be dealt with at any length, some few may be briefly mentioned. Thus, skill can be acquired and is encouraged because it is possible to wait for results not only during the period of acquisition, but during the time necessary to its effective application. Again, the demoralisation arising from temporary mishap or from some unemployment is avoided. Such circumstances are not precluded, but they are stripped of their worst results. The importance of this extends beyond the case of those thus adversely affected. It means a new certainty and so an increase in the hopes which inspire and the

energy which make efficient work. Further, the influence on physique must be taken into account. From all these points of view the security for the future and the provision against risks constitute a most important development in industrial growth.

E. C. K. G.

MR. DOUGLAS KNOOP (University of Sheffield).

DURING recent years a great deal of attention has been devoted to the study of the various problems associated with the production of wealth such as the organisation of capitalists and labourers, the relationship of employers and workers, the annual production of wealth and its distribution among various classes, the rate of earnings in different occupations, the causes of and remedies for unemployment. On the other hand, the problems relating to the consumption of wealth have been comparatively neglected in spite of their great importance. With these problems Mr. Paish deals to some extent; he refers to the growing expenditure upon recreation, upon travel, upon ornamentation, upon clothing, upon housing, upon education, upon literature, upon the preservation of health and upon food; also to the large sums which are being and which have been saved and invested. All these things are doubtless indications of wealth, but in what way are they signs of progress as far as individual consumers are concerned? To provide for contingencies during life such as sickness and unemployment, for old age and for wife and family after death is a wise method of disposing of some part of income, as it gives a very good return for the money so spent. Further, where it is done, it shows a power to realise the future and its responsibilities, which in itself is an encouraging sign. The steady increases in the funds accumulated by Friendly Societies, Industrial Insurance Companies, Building Societies, Trade Unions, Savings Banks and Co-operative Societies all point to the savings effected by people with small incomes. There are doubtless many people in a position to save who do not do so and there is plenty of scope for improvement; nevertheless it is satisfactory to note that habits of thrift appear to be growing.

The increasing expenditure upon education, upon the preservation of health and to a large extent upon housing, is mostly incurred by the State and not by individual members of Society; the individual has little or no choice in the matter, and it is not due in any great measure to his personal efforts that his children are better educated and that he and his family live under healthier and more sanitary conditions. These are certainly judicious forms of expenditure by the State in the interests of social welfare, but they throw little or no light on the problem of how individuals consume their wealth. Mr. Paish notes among other things the growing expenditure upon recreation, upon ornamentation, upon clothing. It is very desirable that people should have opportunities for reasonable enjoyments and pleasures during their leisure hours, that they should appreciate things which are beautiful and seek to surround themselves with such, and that they should be properly

and adequately clothed. On the other hand, if these things are overdone, they cannot be regarded as representing money wisely spent. The great crowds which gather at football matches on Saturday afternoons and even on other days in the week, and the large attendances night after night at music halls and picture palaces, for example, may be indications of prosperity, but can hardly be regarded as judicious consumption. So far as women workers are concerned, there appears to be a tendency to spend an undue proportion of earnings upon dress.

The standard of life to-day among the people is very different from what it was half a century ago. It is undoubtedly higher, thanks partly to the efforts of the State and partly to the rise in money wages in conjunction with the increased purchasing power of money. But so far as this latter cause is concerned, it would be a bold man or woman who would deny that greater progress could have been made, if the growing wealth had been consumed more wisely. Social reformers devote the great bulk of their attention to trying to secure a better distribution of wealth amongst the people; there is a sort of tacit assumption that when once wealth is more evenly distributed all will be well. This overlooks entirely the difficulties associated with the spending of income. On very many people an increase in income is simply wasted, because they do not know how to use it properly. This applies to people with large incomes and to those with small ones, but it is more serious in the case of people with small incomes because in this case sixpence or a shilling wasted may deprive a man and his family of something of which they stand in real need. Everybody knows that some families are better off on thirty shillings a week than other families in the same town and in the same sphere of life are on three pounds a week, simply because the former understand so much better than the latter what may be called the art of consumption. There is an enormous field here for educational work of a social type which is at present inadequately covered. The lessons given to elementary school children in domestic economy and in thrift are entirely on right lines and the more emphasis that is laid on this work the better. If only higher ideals of living, from a material point of view, and a greater knowledge of how income should be used in order to obtain the greatest utility from it, could be imparted to young people, far greater social progress could be attained. A better general education will exercise influence of a suitable kind but it is primarily in the home that all these things should be learnt; when, however, parents fail to guide their children in this respect by example and teaching, the only solution seems to be for other people to attempt to perform the work. In this direction there appears to lie perhaps the greatest prospect of effecting a real increase in social welfare.

D. K.

PROFESSOR SMART (University of Glasgow).

PERHAPS the best service I can do to the present discussion is to confine myself strictly to a single point in Mr. Paish's very suggestive paper. It is the one first alluded to, namely, the enormous

burst of individual expenditure within very recent years, typified, I think, by the use of the motor car. Mr. Paish speaks of the car as "the plaything of a great many persons who, but a short time ago, were unable to set up a carriage." But is it quite certain that those who now spend hundreds on a motor were previously *unable* to spend tens on a brougham? I cannot believe that, in quite recent years, there has been any such sudden increase of wealth; but I can understand—and I believe—that many people, who once would have saved a large portion of their income and added it to capital, now spend most of their income as they earn it.

In such a tendency, there may be nothing to condemn. I have always held that a working man who spent all his wages in giving himself and his family a good house, good food and clothing, education, and wise holidays, was insuring his and their future, though in a different way from putting money in the savings bank—particularly in view of the fact that it was the children who benefited most by this expenditure in the years when they were most plastic. He was taking a risk, no doubt, but a risk that justified itself if he lived long enough to see that the expenditure had been an investment in the "necessaries of efficiency." And this risk must be taken if the poor man is to set up his sons in the occupations where their future is most secure from competition with machinery: the training necessary for the professions and for the many "services" takes time, is very expensive, and, notoriously, does not allow of much saving to the middle class parent.

But, when increased expenditure of income is not of the nature of insurance—which may, as in this case, ultimately add far more to the national capital than would be added by mere bank deposits—but is simply expenditure upon luxury, as it obviously is to-day among the richer classes, the question is raised: What is the effect on savings generally? Does it not involve a slower progress in the accumulation of national capital? And is this of no moment?

Perhaps I am old-fashioned, but I hold that the cure for most of our economic evils is not to be hoped for in any mechanical redistribution, but in a progress of wealth so great as to allow a constant rise in real wage, and to make every sober wage-earner a "capitalist" as well. Every one recognises that the handicap of the working man is that he cannot put a reserve price on his labour or on the labour of his children, and so has neither the time nor the chance of employing it where it would be most remunerative, and, at the same time, most profitable to the community. Give him some capital and this handicap disappears. In this respect, then, the possible check to the accumulation of capital, involved in immediate expenditure of income, is at least a subject which requires consideration before we can congratulate ourselves whole-heartedly on it as a sign of abounding wealth.

But, quite apart from the effect on savings, there is another question which arises out of this increased expenditure. For want of economic education, the rich man, as a rule, has no notion of how his particular methods of expenditure are affecting the nation generally. He repeats quite cheerfully the hoary fallacy that "spending is good for trade." So it is, but there are trades and trades. A great war is good for some trades; a big fire, for

others. To spend thousands in decorating a ballroom with roses in midwinter rejoices the heart of the rose-grower; but is it nothing that capital has been sunk and labour expended on that which is thrown out next morning? Compare this, for instance, with a similar amount of capital and labour expended on a building which remains and serves to shelter men and women for years after.

This, of course, is not to pass judgment on luxury as "culpable." All I mean to do is to put two very old questions. First, is the community yet rich enough to *consume* (a different thing from *spend*) without thinking? Second, will it ever be rich enough even to spend without thinking? For it is possible, by wise expenditure, at once to "employ labour," to employ it in ways that raise the labourer (that is, by giving him congenial and self-realising work), and to employ it in producing permanent sources of enjoyment and well-being.

But, indeed, we economists are much to blame. We have written endless volumes on the production, exchange, and distribution of wealth—little, as yet, on consumption as it affects the future of the community.

W. S.

PROFESSOR URWICK (King's College, London University).

I AM afraid it must seem a very heartless thing to throw a douche of cold criticism upon an article which breathes a spirit of cheery optimism from every paragraph. I should certainly not venture to do so, were I not quite convinced that Mr. Paish's optimism is of a dangerous and deceptive sort. Perhaps it is permissible to suggest, at the very outset, that it cannot possibly be right to say to a very selfish, very greedy, and (on the whole) very irreligious people, "Behold, how excellent are your doings, and how munificently they react upon the rest of the world!" Or, if it is right at all, it certainly cannot be right for a serious sociologist to say so, but only for a journalist composing, in a moment of ecstatic exuberance, a pæan in praise of some festival of empire. And this would be true, even though every one of Mr. Paish's laudatory statements were accurate. It may quite well be the case that our method of wealth-getting by lending capital to every nation in the world has led to the opening up of enormous sources of production everywhere. But it may equally be the case that neither we nor others have yet learned at all how to relate this increased production to anything worthy of the name of progress, and that we are all just at the beginning of the complex difficulties which accompany the increase. It is here, indeed,—in his apparent conception of progress,—that I most of all differ from Mr. Paish. If progress really means an eternal increase of larger and larger beefsteaks, and more and yet more exhilarating skittles, then no doubt all he says is justified. But if progress has anything at all to do with growth of the power to use even a little well, then every one of his assertions is false. And to exhort us to go on "developing" the rest of the world in order, primarily, that there may be more wealth for us to use or misuse, is plainly wrong, unless the exhortation is conditioned by a proviso that our motives and methods must be very considerably altered.

I shall not, in a short note, attempt to do more than indicate my fundamental antagonism to Mr. Paish's position; but two points are worth emphasising. First, there is little doubt that in every community in which wealth is most rapidly increasing the outstanding characteristic of the people is their growing discontent, restlessness, and dissatisfaction. Secondly, the method of wealth development extolled by Mr. Paish has never yet been freed from this ominous difficulty, that it increases parasitism through an ever larger proportion of the population. And it is not easy to see how progress or prosperity is compatible with either growing discontent or growing parasitism.

Incidentally it may be noted that, as usually happens, the optimism of M. Paish's article is only made plausible by the introduction of several statements which are very much less than half true. He harps on the comforting assertion that "the world has become increasingly conscious of the fact that . . . a nation's prosperity is enhanced, not diminished, by the prosperity of other nations"; that "the hatred of the foreigner has largely disappeared," and so on. Is this really his interpretation of anti-alien legislation, tariff-walls, and the now nearly universal conviction that if Germany is growing richer it must be at Britain's expense? He asserts that labour must get higher wages, and therefore more demand-power, for otherwise it will be impossible for the world to consume the additional wealth that is going to be created and progress will be checked. Can he tell us of any limit, actual or theoretical, to the process of consumption or waste of wealth on the part of the rich, whether labourers are getting enough to eat or not? He would do well, surely, to read Mr. Veblen's "Theory of the Leisure Class" and Mr. Ponsonby's "The Camel and the Needle's Eye" on this subject.

I do not here touch upon the economic theory implied in this article. Perhaps that may safely be left to Mr. J. A. Hobson or Mr. J. M. Robertson to deal with.

E. J. U.

SIR EDWARD BRABROOK, C.B.

In venturing to offer some passing observations on the subject of Savings and the Social Welfare, which has been so ably opened by Mr. Paish, I do not claim to speak with any sort of authority on the question. To Mr. Paish, it would seem that the great increase of recent years in expenditure upon every kind of personal indulgence is a sign of healthy progress. May we not, however, discern in this doctrine some revival of the old fallacy that extravagance is good for trade? Apart from the moral deterioration that accompanies self-indulgence, is not the wasteful consumption of things an injury to the community? Mr. Paish's argument is, no doubt, based on the increased consumption of things that contribute to the better nourishment of individuals, the progress of the nation, and the enjoyment of life:—but is that the whole of the question? Should not the wasteful use of wealth be also taken into consideration?

Mr. Paish makes some forcible observations on the elimination

of the physical and mental barriers which have impeded progress in the past. This is illustrated by the practice of the ancient trade-guilds. They had stringent rules against the admission of foreigners to work at their trades: but they meant by foreigners not the persons who came from another country, but the persons who came from another town. They probably would have welcomed persons from another country, if they brought with them the trade secrets of that country; what they could not stand was competition in their own limited field at home. We have long since left behind such narrow parochial views; but we have not advanced as far as we might have done in the conviction that the prosperity of other countries implies an advantage to all. We are still dominated by the idea that we are nothing if not predominant, and we watch the growth of trade in other countries as if it was taking away something that belonged to us. The argument sometimes runs thus:—Country A has increased its trade by so much per cent.; your increase is only so much (less) per cent. But if the original trade on which this increase is calculated was greater with you than with A, the volume of increase may also be greater. Even taking the volume of increase, the lesser volume added to a larger initial amount may again produce a greater result; so that all this may be true, and yet the supremacy of your own country be unaffected. But if it were affected, is that supremacy of the country which happens to be yours a law of nature that is never to be broken? If your country has trade enough, what does it matter to you that another country has more than you have?

These observations, however, are by the way and have little relation to the main thread of Mr. Paish's argument, which bears on the good effect upon the trade of Great Britain and of the world which results from the lavish contributions to the industries of foreign countries made out of the surplus capital of the British investor. In this his conclusion appears to be unassailable, and in no way to be weakened by the consideration that the main inducement which has led to the employment of British capital in aid of the development of foreign industries may have been that of a higher remuneration in interest and dividend than capital can generally claim on home employment.

Even here there may, perhaps, be a call for some qualification. Not all the British capital that has been invested abroad has been wisely invested. Some of us, like the late Mr. Pipchin, may have broken our hearts in pumping water out of the Peruvian mines. These temporary disasters that arise from injudicious speculation do not, however, affect the permanent prosperity of the country, and every one must hope that the forecast of the future which has been drawn for us by Mr. Paish's eloquent optimism may be fully realised.

E. B.

MISS B. L. HUTCHINS.

MR. PAISH's bounding optimism is cheering, especially after the lamentations we have recently been hearing from those whose patriotism takes the odd form of a prolonged *crise de nerfs*. But to say the truth, Mr. Paish is not much more convincing in his

way than the Jeremiahs of the Sunday papers are in theirs. He is no doubt quite right when he says we have vastly increased our savings, but is he also right in assuming that this increase spells a proportionate increase in social welfare? The question of distribution comes in here. It is doubtless quite true that wages and spending power have largely increased, in those classes for which we have fairly reliable information; but it has to be remembered (1) that our wage statistics began in a period of great poverty and misery, (2) that from the very nature of the case, the information comes from the better organised trades, in which earnings are best and employment most regular. Mr. Paish says nothing about the mass of irregularly employed labour that is to be found in the poorer quarters of all our great cities. Recent researches have shown the tendency of dock work, the building trades, and others, to collect in certain centres a number of workers in excess of those who can be regularly employed. These workers know that jobs are to be had, and on occasion very well-paid jobs; there is no machinery of organisation to adjust the supply of labour to the demand,* and the result is what has been aptly called, a "stagnant pool" of under-employed, or irregularly employed labour. These are the men who get demoralised by what they ironically call "playing," and by the resulting cadging for odd jobs, which easily shades into begging. Then there are the cases of the sweated worker, and the slum child, often closely connected with those of men unemployed. Thousands of women can scarcely earn their five or six shillings a week, even with unremitting toil for twelve or thirteen hours a day. Some most experienced observers think that, apart from the operation of the Trades Boards Act (which, of course, is still a new departure), the wages of this class of work are actually falling. Again, rents are so high that poor families often live three or four in a room (there are worse cases still, but these will serve), and milk at 4d a quart is far too dear for the children, save in the smallest quantities. Is it possible to feel so very proud of the growth of wealth in the face of such facts as these? Again, Mr. Paish seems to have overlooked the fact that part of the increase of wealth consists simply in economic rent. The workers toil, the genius invents, the capitalist saves, the able and enterprising direct and organise, and part of the result of their efforts is that some one else can charge them all higher for the privilege of living and working on his land. There are other forms of unearned increment, such as accrue to the fortunate persons who by means of a patent, by combination, or some other form of monopoly, are in a favourable position in the process of exchange. It may be said, this is inevitable; it is certainly difficult to control, but it is also a qualification that ought to be stated in estimating the effect of savings on the social welfare. Of the enormous power wielded by organised capital for the manipulation of political and municipal institutions, Mr. Paish says nothing. Does he regard it as wholly beneficent?

Mr. Paish seems to me entirely right in pointing out, on p. 190.

* The Labour Exchanges no doubt do something to meet the evil, but other co-ordinated measures will be necessary if the remedy is to be effective.

that the growth of wealth is largely conditioned by the growth of spending power among the workers. Further on, he urges wage-earners to recollect that an increase in the rate of real wages cannot take place unless labour is more efficient than hitherto. Is this so certain? The actual rate of wages depends less on the efficiency of the worker than on his strategic position in bargaining with the employer (*e.g.*, chain makers; some artificial flower makers; the list might be extended). Again, the "efficiency of labour" in Mr. Paish's sense is not the same thing as the personal efficiency of workers. The efficiency of labour depends very largely on the quality of the machinery and other appliances; on the efficiency of the direction in organising work; on the conditions of employment as affecting health and energy. But manual workers have little or no voice in deciding whether such measures as these shall or shall not be taken to improve efficiency. I have said nothing of another set-off against the growth of wealth, and that is the immense power acquired by organised capital to direct industry into channels, some of which are absolutely injurious and anti-social, others merely futile and foolish. We still see money squandered in so-called amusements that are really only an excuse for useless display and boredom, and grudged for, of all things, the education and nurture of the young. We still see that the power to produce wealth has outgrown the power to spend wisely for the social welfare.

There is one really hopeful sign of the present time, and that is not, to me, so much the increase of savings, as the evidence of the dawning of a spirit of corporate life and consciousness. The individualism of the Victorian age is beginning to give place to Sir Oliver Lodge's wise motto, Public expenditure and private thrift. We are coming to realize, some of us, that there is more that needs changing than the habits of the working class. Capital is a good servant, but a bad master. When we have learnt to control its uses for human and civic purposes instead of letting it disfigure our cities, exploit our labour, and degrade our amusements as it does now, we shall be able to appraise more accurately than we can at present the place of Savings in the Social Welfare.

B. L. H.

DR. HAROLD H. MANN (Principal of the Agricultural College, Poona).

I AM afraid that I have not the data at hand to discuss generally the surprisingly optimistic paper read by Mr. George Paish at a recent meeting of the Sociological Society. But, in discussing the condition of India, he makes a statement which seems of so doubtful a character that I feel it should not be allowed to pass without remark.

"The welfare of the people of India," says Mr. Paish, "has also immensely improved in the last two generations." Is this the case? It is commonly said, I know; but there is a strong and constantly increasing body of opinion in India that the economic condition of the vast mass of the people is not improving, but, on the contrary, is distinctly below what it was only a

generation ago. The mass of available wealth has certainly increased very considerably, but it is, in far greater proportion than before, in the hands of a small fraction of the population.

For the mass of the agricultural population, though prices have gone up, yet the cost of living has also gone up in an even greater proportion. In this land of small-holders, the most striking feature of the last census (1901) was the large decrease in the number of landholders, and the enormous increase in the number of landless labourers.

Again, as far as these very labourers are concerned, in more than half the centres for which data are easily accessible, the price of the staple food of the people has advanced more than the wages for "able-bodied agricultural labourers" during the past twenty-five years. In face of facts like these, the proposition of Mr. Paish with regard to India seems open to very grave doubt. I do not deny that it may be true. It may be that there are factors which give to the figures from which I am arguing a different meaning from that which many people in India are inclined to put upon them. The matter can only be settled by a careful and detailed local study of the conditions and how they are changing. But I should be very sorry if, with regard to India, Mr. Paish's *ex cathedra* utterance should be considered an undoubted truth.

H. H. M.

DR. BINNIE DUNLOP.

(1) Mr. Chiozza Money asks: Why have the great mass of the people so small a share of the total savings? Because—owing to an ignorance for which their rulers and teachers, though Individualists, are largely responsible—they have more children than they can afford to maintain properly. Parents cannot save, cannot strike for more than a bare subsistence wage and cannot keep their children during apprenticeship years. Thus the only individualistic remedy for the Chronic Poverty evil (and therefore the only effective Anti-Socialism) is State Emigration, or failing that segregation, of all necessitous children.

(2) The evil of large private accumulations of savings is not, as commonly suggested, that they cause the poverty of the poor, but that they may cause excessive expenditure on luxuries. Thus a State that feels itself in need of increased supplies of men and money to resist foreign aggression, should tax luxuries—including, of course, under-developed land—on their capital value.

B. D.

MR. JOHN ROSS. (University Hall, Chelsea).

MR. PAISH has painted a glowing picture of the expansion of material resources which has characterized modern times. That this quantitative prosperity is, however, quite the glorified vision which he sees it to be, cannot be altogether admitted. The amazing display of "wealth," the extravagant expenditure, the vast production and enormous demand, the colossal capital of the nation, are all readily observable phenomena—are indeed obtrusively obvious. But (accepting for the moment Mr. Paish's use of the term

"wealth") does all this "quantity of wealth," this increase of efficiency in producing it, this "advancing state of comfort," necessarily make for the social welfare, or in any real way indicate a condition of social well-being?

Whilst the title of the paper and its opening rather encourage the expectation that the subject is to be dealt with from this standpoint, one looks in vain for any such treatment. On the contrary it appears to be assumed that all is for the best, and the triumphant enumeration of quantitative prosperity rises to a positive paean in the prospect of an endless vista of food and raw materials flanked by more and more British millions! Yet if "the only wealth is life," what quality of life has all this vast quantitative prosperity brought with it? Has it improved or debased it? In the very inequality of its distribution is there not an inherent degeneration? Are we, for instance, to regard the utter hideousness and squalor of most of our manufacturing towns as something quite apart from any questions of social welfare, as merely accidental and of no serious account compared with the blessedness of their busy material prosperity? The question has only to be put to be answered unhesitatingly in the negative.

Again: without a high standard—that is to say, a qualitatively high standard—of life, all attempts at increasing the national welfare must be fruitless. Material and quantitative prosperity there doubtless will be, but "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth," and it is of small value to himself or to the nation if the quality of the life which these possessions procure for him be poor and mean, in short, unsocial.

The time would seem to be ripe for a serious consideration of our standards of prosperity and of the means of attaining thereto. Here is an opportunity for the nation to "more fully recognise the solidarity of its interests," to see that filth and squalor, misery and evil conditions, for one or any section of the community react to the detriment of the community at large, and that finance which draws its support from the community at this price is unsocial in its action and does not, however apparently prosperous, make for the social welfare.

The question is one which may easily be prejudiced by treatment from a purely sentimental standpoint. Therefore it is urgently desirable that some attempt should be made to lift the discussion to a rational level, and in no way can this be so well attained as by studying the problem from a sociological standpoint. A careful study of the social phenomena arising from the varied occupations, trades and enterprises of the nation would form an invaluable basis for an attempt to discriminate between finance social and unsocial, and might lead to the socialising of much of the unsocially worked enterprise of the present day. Not long ago we saw the Churches exercised in their conscience on the question of investment, mainly in brewery concerns; and although we may not all agree with what might readily lead to an *Index Expurgatorius* and a display of narrowness and bigotry, it may be admitted that there was some ground for their uneasiness in the matter. It rests with the Sociological Society to carry the general inquiry a stage further, and they might well make this a subject of special investigation and report.

J. R.

MR. PAISH'S REPLY.

IN writing my paper I endeavoured to avoid all temporary and local conditions and to indicate some of the great forces which have brought about the remarkable improvement in the social welfare of the race in modern times. In none of the criticisms is it denied that the material condition of society has greatly improved as a result, and in consequence, of the much closer connection of all the countries of the world with each other through the invention and introduction of the steamship and of the railway. Nor is it denied that the savings of the British people, the employment of a portion of them in the construction of railways everywhere and the resultant strides towards economic unity have been powerful factors in bringing about the improvement in social conditions. My reference to the increase in real wages in this country in the last sixty years was merely for the purpose of proving beyond the shadow of doubt that the mass of the people of Great Britain have largely participated in a world movement, and have derived great advantage from the development and production of the good things with which nature has supplied the world wherever they could be found. It is quite true, as pointed out by Mr. Chiozza Money, that since the 'nineties there has been an appreciable increase in the cost of living, and that this increased cost has more than offset the rise in the rate of wages in Great Britain in the same period. But it must be borne in mind that the cost of living in England fifteen years ago was abnormally low in consequence of the discredit into which a large part of the world fell at that time and which compelled the debtor countries to send to the creditor nations immense quantities of commodities at low prices in payment of their obligations, and that during that period of discredit the rate of wages was relatively high in this country notwithstanding the low cost of living. If comparison is made with the 'eighties, when the world's credit and consumption were normal and when the cost of living was not exceptionally low, it is evident that the rate of real wages in England has appreciably advanced in recent times. According to the Board of Trade's statement of wages and prices there was a rise of some 7 per cent. in the rate of wages with a fall of nearly 12 per cent. in wholesale prices in 1894-7 compared with 1885-8, and there was a further advance of over 12 per cent. in the rate of wages with a recovery of about 20 per cent. in wholesale prices in 1910 compared with 1894-7. Hence in 1910, compared with 1885-8, an advance of nearly 20 per cent. in the rate of wages was attended by a rise of less than 6 per cent. in wholesale prices. Here are the figures:—

		Unweighted mean rate of wages.*		Weighted whole- sale prices.
1910		100·21	108·8
Average 4 years 1894-7	89·83	90·9
Average 4 years 1885-8	83·56	102·9
Increase 1910 compared with average 1885-8	16·55	5·9
	19·8%	5·7%

*Building, coal mining, engineering, textile, and agriculture.

The question of the distribution of wealth was outside the scope of my paper, but one of the most pleasant features of the growing economic unity of the world is the more equitable distribution of the increasing income between the various classes of society. In former times great was the income and the wealth of a comparatively few rich people; the rise of the middle classes more recently has meant that much larger numbers have participated, not merely in the increase of income in which everyone has shared to some extent, but in the accumulations also. At the present time the signs are favourable to the great mass of the people securing not only a higher average real income than formerly, but also a much larger share of the accumulating wealth of the world. This does not mean that wealth already accumulated will be taken from the rich or from the middle classes, but that the masses will obtain a greater proportion than hitherto of the new wealth. It should be recollected that the wealth of the very new countries doubles in a few years, that the wealth of the United States is now doubling every twenty years, that the wealth of Great Britain doubles in about thirty-three years, and that the wealth of most countries is increasing with considerable rapidity. There are indications that in the present generation, while the rich and the middle classes will grow richer than they now are both actually and on the average, the masses will also become much better off, not only as regards income, but also in respect of accumulations. In other words, I look for much larger contributions to the capital fund by the masses now that the rate of real wages has risen to a level which renders savings by wage-earners more possible than in the past.

Mr. Bowley's calculation as to the growth of the income of this country between 1860 and 1906 is very instructive both in respect of the extent of the expansion and of the proportion accruing to capital, and it will be noted that Professor Chapman anticipates that the increase in savings will be so great that the diminution in the average return upon capital, which Mr. Bowley shews has been going on since 1860, will continue. Mr. Bowley and Mr. Chapman unconsciously give a convincing reply to Mr. Hobson, as they show that "the gain of savings" does "pass chiefly to the workers in rising wages."

I entirely agree with Mr. Hobson and other critics that if the expenditure upon luxuries not only of the rich but of persons of moderate means and of wage-earners were reduced, and the money expended in raising the standard of life and efficiency of the workers, the productive power of the nation would be enhanced, and the output of wealth increased. But my statement was intended to deal with another matter. An idea has gained fairly wide acceptance that if a man does more than a minimum amount of work he is "doing a comrade out of a job." It is of the highest importance for all to recognise that there is more real income for the workman as the output of wealth per head is increased. Excessive hours of labour diminish efficiency, but it is to the advantage of all, and more especially of the wage-earner, that each one should work to the best of his ability. High real wages, proper hours of labour, and employment for fellow workmen can be gained by

efficiency, not by slackness, by the largest and not by the smallest output per head.

Mr. Ross, Professor Urwick, and others have very grave doubts as to whether or not the increased material prosperity, which has partly resulted from the great savings and their use in developing the natural resources of the whole world, has caused and is causing the race to increase in intellect and spirituality. Professor Urwick indeed goes so far as to suggest that I am not free from blame in calling attention to the remarkable progress of the race in modern times. He says, "Perhaps it is permissible to suggest at the very outset, that it cannot possibly be right to say to a very selfish, very greedy and (on the whole) very irreligious people 'Behold how excellent are your doings and how munificently they react upon the rest of the world!'" My paper was intended to cover not merely the social welfare of Great Britain but of other countries also. I desired to state frankly the things that I saw, and as to the truth of which the evidence was convincing. Surely Professor Urwick cannot be in earnest when he writes, "Or if it is right at all it cannot be right for a serious sociologist to say so." One of the chief reasons which induced me to write my paper was my desire to get everyone, and especially men of science, to see things as they are; and I have been greatly amused by the general accusation of optimism in spite of my efforts not to stray by a hair's breadth from the path of cold truth. But is it quite accurate, I will say nothing about generosity, to refer even to the British people with all their faults as "very selfish, very greedy and very irreligious?" If they are all these things, how does it come to pass that they are to-day introducing a great measure of invalidity and unemployment assurance by means of which the sufferings of vast numbers of persons will be diminished? How does it happen that these same people have provided pensions for aged citizens, have adopted a children's charter, have introduced free education? What does the great fall in the death-rate in modern times imply? Why is it that medical science is so highly developed and such great care taken to diminish the sufferings of the sick in all classes of society? Have none of these things to do with progress, and have not many of them been the result of the increasing income and wealth of the nation? Furthermore, are not a great many persons looking forward to the introduction of widowhood insurance, to the extension of the school age, to a much better and a much more thorough system of education, to great reforms in the Poor Law, and to many other measures designed to raise the material, moral, and spiritual condition of the nation as soon as the growth in the national income permits them to be accomplished? Is no credit to be given to a nation of which a vast number of persons refrain from living up to their income for the purpose of providing for wife and children in case of misfortune? Has Professor Urwick noticed the immense expansion in the sums paid yearly for life assurance by the middle and wage-earning classes of this country in the past generation, payments which are adding tens of millions a year to the capital fund of the country each year? Lastly, is the decline in drinking, especially when the wealth and income of the nation are growing so rapidly, no indication of a

growth of character? Professor Urwick must live in a world of his own when he doesn't recognise that these things are the marks of a nation growing not only in material riches but also in mental and spiritual endowments.

Surely Professor Urwick knows that Great Britain and Germany are growing richer because they are both taking advantage of the increasing economic unity of the world to obtain their food and raw materials wherever they can be grown, to dispose of their manufactures to all the nations that need them and can pay for them, and to supply capital to every country in which it can be productively employed. Prior to the invention of the steamship and the railway the world's international commerce was almost negligible; to-day its value is measured in thousands of millions of pounds. The tariff barriers have been erected to stem the tide of international commerce and to retard the great movement towards the economic unity of the world, but men might as well erect a wall of sand to stem the flow of the mighty Atlantic as endeavour to prevent the various countries of the world, inhabited by peoples growing rapidly in knowledge and in intelligence, from exchanging the produce they grow and the goods they manufacture. Certainly the wonderful growth of international commerce in recent years indicates that the tide is flowing towards economic unity with increasing swiftness.

G. P.

THE FIRST UNIVERSAL RACES CONGRESS.*

THE idea of the Universal Races Congress is said in the programme to have originated with Dr. Felix Adler, whose works on Moral Education, both inside and outside religious systems, are well known; in this country the soul of the movement has been Mr. G. Spiller, who is familiar to many of us as the author of a profoundly learned and highly original treatise on Psychology, and of a report both theoretical and practical on Moral Education as carried on in different countries. He was also the organizer of a Congress dealing with this subject which met a few years ago and attracted a good deal of attention. The realization of the projected Universal Races Congress will be so very largely due to his energy and persistence that any one who speaks about it must be regarded as interpreting his ideas.

A Congress may be defined as a deliberative assembly, summoned for a single occasion, without executive power. Congresses of authorized plenipotentiaries are obviously quite distinct from those with which we are dealing, which meet merely to communicate discoveries, tabulate results, and formulate principles. Since locomotion became safe, cheap, and easy, assemblies of this sort have been held by a great variety of bodies, industrial, professional, scientific, political, and religious. The idea has been taken up almost with enthusiasm in the East and a Congress which was projected some years ago, though it did not actually assemble, was on a scale comparable with that organized by Mr. Spiller. This was a Panislamic Congress, chiefly for the purpose of discussing the Koranic prohibition of usury, which is said to hamper Moslem commerce. On the other hand a Congress of the Young Turkish Party held in Paris in 1902 is perhaps the most successful that has ever met; for within six years it was followed by the proclamation of the Ottoman Constitution. Congresses of Young Egypt have since then been held in Geneva and Brussels. In March of this year the Copts held a Congress at Asyut, with the view of formulating the demands which they wished to address to the government of their country; and this was to be followed by a Congress of Egyptian Moslems, to consider

* A paper read before the Sociological Society on April 4, 1911.

to what extent they could back the Copts in their demands. Hence the idea of assemblies of the sort described is now no less familiar in the East than in the West. Only the constituency which is to send representatives to Mr. Spiller's is the largest that ever has been invited or ever can be invited to send them. As the Roman poet says, a higher degree in titles than that accorded to the Fabii is not to be found; the Fabii were called the Greatest owing to their merits. Similarly a vaster group of human beings cannot be found than the whole human race. The three purposes which we have seen constitute the scope of a Congress relate naturally to the bond which unites the group. Just as the Coptic Congress concerned itself with problems interesting the Copts as Copts, so that of Races should deal with such as interest men as members either of a race or of the race, supposing that mankind are all one.

In the first place there is the interpretation of the word race itself. For here fact and theory seem somewhat to clash. M. Gobineau, who many years ago composed a remarkable treatise on racial differences, observes that the several groups of the human species are so perfectly separated from each other that no external influence can efface their distinctive peculiarities. The permanency of their differences so long as there is no intermixture produces precisely the same physical and moral results as if the groups were so many distinct and separate creations. But on the other hand, he adds that in such great vortexes of humanity as the capitals of Europe every possible variety of the species has been absorbed. "Negro, Chinese, Tartar, Hottentot, Indian, Malay, and all the minor varieties produced by their mixture have contributed their contingent to the population of our large cities. Since the Roman domination this amalgamation has continually increased, and is still increasing in proportion as invention brings in closer proximity the various portions of the globe." On the one hand then we have to do with the fact that races are theoretically isolated; on the other hand that in the actual state of the world they are mixed. These two aspects of race will form the material for discussions in the first two sessions. It is probable that the main problems which emanate therefrom will be found represented in the list of papers. These include the point of view whence identity can be predicated of races; the factors which tend either to preserve or to mar that identity; the inequalities between races and the problem of their equalization, which Mr. Spiller has reserved for treatment by himself.

On the whole we shall probably find that the results of the

discussions on race are rather scientific than practical, negative than positive. For it has been pointed out that the differences between groups of human beings depend far more upon what man does for himself than upon what nature has done for him. To quote a writer in an anthropological magazine, the expiration of which is much to be regretted, nature can only play a subordinate part in civilized life, if it indeed plays any at all. "Japanese civilization," this writer says, "is superior to Russian, because the Japanese have a more liberal constitution, and a better educational system, in other words because human institutions are more perfect in Japan; it is indifferent whether the Japanese body is by nature better or worse endowed. Just as a man cannot be given intelligence by a course of diet, just as a decrepit body cannot be restored to good health by doctrines, so in general race, *i.e.*, the body, has no influence on the civilization of a nation, *i.e.*, upon their intellectual condition." It is probable that this generalization is somewhat exaggerated, but the history of mankind has produced a series of surprises for those who attributed any sort of superiority to one race over another. Loose as the term race has always been—for every known race has been an agglomeration of races, and been at times at any rate invigorated with fresh blood: thus the Jewish race acknowledges to having assimilated large bodies of newcomers at times in addition to casual proselytes—the assumption of natural superiority over other races has been repeatedly made only to be refuted by hard facts. It is likely that this conclusion is supported by the sciences grouped round anthropology, *vis.* comparative politics, sociology and religion. If any one were asked to mention different races, probably the names Aryan and Semitic would be the first which came into his mind. Yet the mythology and theology of those races exhibit so striking a likeness, their customs and superstitions are so often identical, that racial differences scarcely appear. For the interpretation of many such customs anthropologists go with confidence to races which in common parlance are separated by great gulfs from both. Race therefore represents the common element which intellectual progress has differentiated. According to M. LeBon's interesting doctrine, in which there must be a certain amount of truth, civilized man returns to the savage state when he forms a unit in a crowd, and the more miscellaneous and vast the crowd, the further does he go back; but he can only go back to that which he was originally. In that original state then there must have been the capacity for what he has since become. It is naturally not intended

to criticize the name of the Congress, because when we say that all races are mixed we do not deny the existence of the element, though it may be that it can only be isolated in thought.

But though the racial division is one of great difficulty when any practicable application is desirable, it is not difficult to distinguish the great cross-divisions of mankind, which may be thus enumerated in order of indelibility. The first is that of the sexes, which the great master of classification, Aristotle, found it hard to locate in his system. The second is that of colours of which rough classification is easy, scientific classification difficult. The third is that of nations, which is largely, though not entirely geographical. The three that remain—those of language, religion, and caste—take us further away from the work of nature and end in what appears to be entirely the work of man. The number of individuals who do not fall into all these six cross-divisions is negligible; perhaps religion and caste are the least co-extensive with mankind, yet even in these divisions most individuals admit of being somehow or other grouped. Except in the case of the first there is specific as well as generic grouping, for in order to be a Christian a man must be a Catholic or Protestant, or Jacobite, etc. What may be asserted of all is that such cross-divisions have a tendency to generate conflict, which with the advancement of the race gives way to co-operation. It is wisest to assume that for an unlimited space of time not only the first three but the last three divisions also will continue; but the results which have been achieved in the substitution of co-operation for conflict seem worth tabulating, and principles whereby that process can be accelerated deserve formulation. These then may be regarded as constituting the main purposes of the Universal Races Congress; and we may proceed to range the papers and discussions under these heads.

The first and probably the earliest of those divisions is that of sex, and in the second section there is a paper promised on the Present Position of Women, by Sister Nivedita (Miss Margaret Noble of Calcutta), apparently tabulating results. This lady is known as a writer chiefly on Indian subjects, and her treatise called "The Web of Indian Life" is not only one of the best written but it is also one of the most instructive which we possess on Indian civilization, especially on account of her keen sympathy with and appreciation of Indian institutions. Perhaps no writer at any rate in Europe has ever called so much attention to the merits of that much abused institution, the Indian caste system, which nevertheless, if it be true that the fittest survives, must be of some value.

She gives some remarkable definitions of the word caste: it is the standard of honour associated with rank; a social formulation of defence minus all elements of aggression; thus the doorkeeper of a viceroy's palace would feel his race too good to share a cup of water with the ruler of all India—but he consents to be doorkeeper nevertheless. Her suggestion that the caste system rendered India ready to harbour refugees of all religions, because their own cult protected itself by the caste system, is one of many striking sayings that her book contains. In reference to the position of women in India, after a somewhat glowing picture she remarks that "while every detail of the Indian domestic system is justified and justifiable, we cannot refuse to admit that some great educational adjustment is necessary at this moment." Although then her opinions on the condition of women will perhaps be more optimistic than the ablest of her countrywomen here are in the habit of formulating, we are likely to profit from the freshness of her views and her sympathy with her Indian sisters.

Sister Nivedita, then, desires for the Indian woman an education which will enable her to be a greater power for good among her people. It is a remarkable fact that those who ascribe the backwardness of the East largely to the imperfect education of the women, often fail to see that the higher education will bring with it the desire for more power, *i.e.*, for greater equality with men, and the Universal Races Congress will give opportunities for fair discussion of this matter, not in reference to one country only, but in reference to all. It will not in this respect resemble either a Suffrage Congress or an Anti-Suffrage Congress, where all the speakers are agreed about the end, and are estimating the relative efficiency of means. It is perhaps worth observing that this matter is occasioning nearly as much perplexity in the Nearer East as in the West. There as here women are exhibiting capacity in various professions which had been generally regarded as monopolies of men, and the theory that the female intellect is hopelessly inferior to the male is breaking down. The cry for the suffrage has been heard even in Mohammedan cities, and champions of women's rights have arisen in Cairo and Baghdad.

It seems clear that there is a possibility of discussing this and similar questions which affect womankind from a wider survey than is possible when they are treated in reference to one particular nation. For it is evident that some of the chief causes of modification in human relations affect the women of the whole world alike; the substitution of normal peace for normal war and the substitution

of brain power for bodily force. If in this country the suffrage question and those that go with it force themselves on our attention, it is not that nature has changed, but that the conditions have changed. The survey of the Races Congress may enable us then to estimate two anti-suffrage arguments more impartially than we otherwise might. India, we are told, would not endure to be ruled by a nation which has adopted women's suffrage. But what, if the Indian woman is herself clamouring for something that is analogous? Women should not vote, because they do not fight. But what, if we are looking forward to a period at which men will not fight either?

The Conflict of Colour has been set forth quite recently in a luminous work by Mr. Putnam Weale, who has given some pledges to fortune in that he has ventured on prophecies, yet rather more cautiously than his forcible style might suggest to an inattentive reader. Like *Manu* he divides the world into four colours: the White, the Yellow, the Brown, and the Black. The point of view from which he regards their relations is essentially different from that which is adopted by the Congress; he foresees danger to the Whites from the other three, and suggests in some cases diffidently in other confidently counsels whereby the danger can be averted or at least alleviated. To discuss the wisdom or even the feasibility of those expedients would take the present writer far out of his depth; but some of them may be briefly mentioned, with the view of illustrating the difference of attitude which has been indicated. In the Far East there is the Yellow Peril; the Yellow races outnumber the White already, and are likely to do so increasingly; the remedy is to back China against Japan. In the Nearer East there is the Brown peril; the remedy is to establish a balance of power by the creation of a new Asiatic state. In Africa and perhaps in America there is the Black peril; conversion of the Blacks to Christianity may make them somewhat less formidable. Mr. Putnam Weale holds strongly that between men of different colours no love is or is ever likely to be lost. "There exists a widespread racial antipathy founded on colour; an animal-like instinct, if you will, but an instinct which must remain in existence until the world becomes Utopia." Mr. Meredith Townsend is quoted for the opinion that the more the White and the Brown races see of each other, the less friendly they become; members of Parliament who have never visited India are more sympathetic towards Indians than Indian Civil Servants. It is true that Mr. Weale is not prepared to accept this doctrine

absolutely. In the case of the Black races, however, his formula is very similar. In Europe the Negro is so exceptional that he passes unnoticed; in the two Americas, in Africa, and along the vast Asiatic coast-line as well as in the world of island outposts along each of these continents, the coal-black native is almost universally considered as a man utterly separated from the rest and therefore not far removed from being accursed.

Now the Congress does not accept these premisses, and endeavours to treat colour not as a matter of no consequence, but as no reason in itself for animosity. At one time in our cities any man in an unusual costume might be mobbed, and was at any rate liable to be insulted; but such treatment is now universally regarded by thinking persons as merely a sign of bad manners and deficient education. Difference of colour may indeed have a vast variety of consequences and accompaniments, but the earning of hatred is not one of them. It would seem clear that the most important consequence must be a geographical one: *vis.* that certain climates suit one colour better than another. But even if there are other consequences, among them in the negro's cases inferiority in literature, science and art, in that of the brown races inferiority in political capacity, these are no fit grounds for vindictiveness.

Islam has been justly praised for having done much to abolish colour prejudice, and it is remarkable that it should have done so, since the Koran makes whiteness of face and blackness of face synonymous with salvation and damnation. A fairly early monument of Islamic literature is an essay in which the superiority of the black races to the white is urged, the evidence being of a sort which might well appeal to Moslems though scarcely to others; e.g. the fact that the words of a black prophet, Lukman, are cited in the Koran, and that many of the prophet's most faithful and distinguished followers were black. The essay is evidently a specimen of the paradoxical style, of which the Greek rhetors furnished examples. There is evidence that this prejudice was never wholly overcome, though it was unorthodox; for Islam while recognizing the institutions of slavery and concubinage also maintained the equality of all Moslems; moreover St. Paul's doctrine that the son of the slave-woman was not the equal of the free-woman's son had to be discarded by a nation which professed to be descended from Abraham and Hagar; and it is a most interesting fact that this story should lead to two contrary deductions according as the vanity of the arguers was gratified or wounded

by it. Nevertheless this equality was often theoretic rather than practical; and it would be possible to cite passages from authors of most Islamic centuries indicating contempt for the negro. And although all authorities appear to be agreed that the lot of the slave in those Islamic countries where the institution is still maintained is not only tolerable but at times even enviable, there is no case in which Islam of its own initiative endeavoured to abolish slavery and the black races have regularly formed the slave-dealer's natural hunting-ground. The merit of abolishing slavery belongs, then, wholly to Christianity, and indeed to the Christianity of the last century or two. That is a step forward which can never be retraced, but its consequences suggest various problems. It will be found that these furnish a large proportion of the material for discussion; practically the whole of the sixth section being devoted to them. The question of inter-racial marriage is treated in the second section, and an account is to be given of the actual result of mixture between black and white races in Brazil, a country in which this is stated to be tolerated more than elsewhere. The position of the negro in the world generally, and in the continents of Africa and America will also be treated both from the European and from the negro side.

On the subject of the Negro in Africa the Congress is fortunate in having secured as reader a man whose qualifications to speak on this matter may perhaps be called unrivalled—Sir Harry Johnston. His monumental works on Uganda, Liberia, and other African lands not only reveal the profoundest acquaintance with negro and negroid, but they also show a disposition to judge these races at their best, and to dwell far more on their capacity for progress than on what Mr. Weale calls their arrested development. The supposed danger of a combination of black against white with which we are at times threatened seems answered by his sentence: "No single separate African race or tribe has yet felt anything like solidarity with the black race in general; otherwise Europe and Asia would not continue to dominate Africa."

Far more important than the Negro problem in Africa seems to be the same in America, and Mr. Spiller, who visited the States in order to arouse interest in the Congress, not only succeeded in doing so among the citizens of New York, but it would appear that the government of the States was disposed to interest itself officially, and did not refrain from doing so through any want of sympathy with the enterprise. What the Negro difficulty in America means probably can only be realized by those who have lived there, but

the prospect of having it presented at once from the side of the whites and the side of the blacks should attract many listeners. The public have been prepared for such a debate by a work of singular eloquence, and, as it seems to the present writer, nobility of aspiration, called "The Basis of Ascendancy," by Mr. Edgar Gardner Murphy, bearing date 1909. This writer tells us that the distance between the average life of the negro in the United States and the average life of the negro in contemporary Africa is so overwhelmingly evident that the progress of the negro during his three hundred years on American soil becomes one of the most astonishing achievements of the history of the Republic. Although then he regards amalgamation of race as wholly undesirable, and believes that it has a tendency to decrease rather than to increase, he is also a believer in the negro's capacity for progress; yet that progress will make him more of a negro as well as more of a man, i.e., will render him less and less desirous to be merged in the dominant race. "Deliverance from the negro danger lies not solely in the white man's baldly assuming the perpetual attitude of the policeman over his treasure, but in giving the negro a treasure too: and as he becomes slowly conscious of his treasure, he himself becomes also a policeman, or guard as a man and as a race over his own." That consciousness of solidarity between the black races which hitherto has not existed, is predicted as a result of the progress of the negro in the United States, who will regard the redemption and elevation of the African negro as essentially his concern. In this awakening of the sense of solidarity then no danger or disadvantage to the white races is anticipated, because, as this writer insists, the progress of the lower elements in a society involves with it the progress of the higher elements; society is not only pulled, but is also pushed upwards. The presence of a community of many millions who had accepted disenfranchisement would, he thinks, be demoralizing to the others. The prospect however of two communities which did not amalgamate enjoying equal rights within and sharing the same state without perpetual friction is one wherein light might be desired. For if the progressive black man is neither to be a copy of nor to be merged in the white, but to develop a racial sentiment and pride, and even history of his own, it is hard to see how that friction can be avoided. From the white side the solution to this problem will be presented by Mr. Milholland, who has displayed his interest in the Congress in the most striking manner.

From the negro side it will be presented both for America and

Africa by men who have made their mark and whose names are well-known; it is sufficient to quote some words from the preface to one of Dr. Blyden's series of lectures to make clear the point of view which he represents: "he has sought to fix the attention of the negro upon original ideas and conceptions as to his place in the economy of the world; the black man is engaged in the discovery of his true place in creation upon natural and rational lines." To quote Dr. Blyden himself: "the precise problem of the education of the African is to develop his powers as an African, a strange man to the European, in the way wherein he should go." "A true knowledge of the native proves that the negro has a mind of his own, one which it is worse than useless to try and drag into what at best must be a bad imitation of a wholly different thing, the European mind-form." One can imagine that any accurate formulation of the differences between these minds and the functions which they can best discharge would be of the highest value. But if that is not possible, then statistics demonstrating the opposite, *viz.*, that the colour is an accident and the environment everything, would also be luminous. For indeed unless Dr. Blyden in his lectures insisted on his colour, it seems most improbable that any reader would detect it from his language or thought.

The third cross-division is that of nations. That there is a sort of hierarchy of nations is generally acknowledged in popular parlance; but that hierarchy is qualitative as well as quantitative—a third-rate power meaning either one which comes in a third class in the numbers of its subjects, and the figure of its budget, or one which takes a third class in the rating of its civilisation. From both points of view there would seem to be such a thing as minority, *i.e.*, a condition wherein either the quantity or the quality falls below the standard which permits of the nation standing alone without danger to itself and to others. The test of progress in all these cases is the extent to which co-operation is being substituted for conflict; and it must be obvious that an independent nation co-operates more effectively than one which is under protection owing to qualitative incompetence; to take Mr. Putnam Weale's ideal, an India which was capable of orderly self-government would be co-operating more efficiently than one which required the services of another country to keep it in order. Here, then, there is considerable opportunity for the tabulation of results, both with reference to the prevention of conflict between equal powers, and to the progress of powers not yet in the first

qualitative class towards it. These constitute the materials for statements and discussions in the third and fourth sessions, while in the seventh session some new principles will be formulated. Those who will initiate the discussion in all these sessions are persons whose names are well-known in connexion with international arbitration, the widest treatment of the subject being reserved for the President of the International Peace Bureau, M. H. La Fontaine. In spite of objections it is generally believed that the advance of democracy makes for peace and progress, whence great interest attaches to the series of papers in Session 3, devoted to the growth of parliamentary rule in independent countries, and the preparation for it among nations still in their minority. They will include statements by authoritative speakers on the immediate results of the introduction of the legislative chamber into countries where it has come of late years as a surprise, in particular Persia, the very mention of which in connexion with constitutional government aroused the mirth of Herodotus's Greek contemporaries.

But there are also international relations which are not precisely political, due to the ever-growing inter-communication of both material and intellectual produce. It is of some interest to know the strength of the tendencies towards general fusion of interests on international lines; because it rests with the workers more than with any other class to prevent wars in the future, by rendering the number and variety of the strands in the international bond such that a rupture of relations between two states shall become as impossible as say for London to go to war with Birmingham. It has already been asserted that this stage has been reached; that the hardship and even ruin involved by such rupture would make responsible statesmen avoid war at all hazards; but it is desirable that the evidence for this, or at any rate an estimate of the forces that make in this direction should be put before those whom the question interests in an intelligible form by competent thinkers. It will be seen that Sections IIIa and IV are mainly concerned with matters of this sort.

The fourth cross-division is of the least importance, and it is now probably acknowledged that the division of mankind by languages by no means corresponds to a race-division; indeed there are too many historically attested cases of whole nations having adopted a conqueror's language to permit of any doubt obtaining on this subject. A paper has been sent in by the present writer on the subject of the influence of language in separ-

ating or consolidating nations; and his results are mainly negative: the nations who have best maintained their isolation have both lost their languages—the Jews and the Copts. A more interesting branch of the subject is then the project of a universal language on which we are to hear the person who has hitherto made the most successful attempt at grappling with the problem practically—the author of Esperanto. To a certain extent we are all familiar with his expedient; and indeed there have been Esperanto congresses. Probably then we may expect in this case to find the tabulation of results—some account of the success of this project, of fresh developments, and whether there is reason for supposing that progress is steady, so that the fate of similar schemes which have for a time had adherents is not now to be feared. The present writer in his paper has endeavoured to insist on the futility of endeavours to put life into dying languages with the view of maintaining some nationality; on the ground that a dead language can perform that service as well as a living one, as the cases of the Jews and the Copts show.

The fifth cross-division, Religion, has been the subject of many congresses, but the aspect whence they have dealt with it is quite different from that which will be presupposed here. Thus there have been congresses of different churches, and of missionary organizations; a congress of missions to Islam was held a few years ago in Cairo, nearly as bold an experiment as holding a rationalistic congress in Rome; the one city being as noteworthy for its attachment to Islam as was the other for its religious intolerance. One paper dealing with the influence of missions is to be supplied by Dr. Caldecott. On this subject much the same may be said initially as on the Colour question; between different religions there is not necessarily any conflict, and there is a possibility of co-operation. This has already come about in many countries to an extent which some centuries ago would have seemed impossible; and it has come about through the general recognition of the existence of certain needs that can better be dealt with by religious authorities than by any others; whence not only in this country it is customary to see co-operation between the different religious communities at least on certain occasions. The study of comparative religion or of the history of religions, which itself furnished the material for a congress a short time ago, is very different from the study of the subject in reference to social needs. Those which can best be dealt with by religions have scarcely yet been accurately formulated, though they are vaguely understood;

their effectiveness for supplying those needs appears to be capable of tabulation and registration, whence religion might in certain aspects be turned into an experimental science, into which it seems certain that conditions of climate must enter, and it may be that others no less capable of exact measurement might be introduced. Thus that Islam should have won no permanent territory further north than 42 N. latitude appears to be evidence of the connexion between climate and religion. And the same might be inferred from the rapidity with which it spread in India and now spreads in Africa, as contrasted with the slow progress which Christianity makes. The idea of introducing experiment into religion is not a new one. Elijah's sacrifice on Mount Carmel was as much a scientific experiment as any ever conducted in a laboratory. What is rather wanted now is observation in lieu of experiment; and when there is any mass of tabulated observation, it is clear that missionary activity will ultimately be conducted in accordance with the principles which the results suggest. That there are forms of religion in the world which have absolutely failed to discharge their function must be acknowledged; and that others have performed it most inefficiently is also a historical fact. But the principle whereby we are to be guided in deciding which demand abolition and which are capable of reform must be that of tabulated observation; for if the principle to which we adhere is consideration of abstract claims, there is no chance of agreement being reached.

The name of Prof. Rhys Davids, who is reading a paper on Religion as a consolidating and separating influence, is well-known and he has had extraordinary success in expounding the doctrines of Buddhism. It is not permissible to anticipate the line which his paper will take, but it may be divined that he will ascribe to it greater power for isolating than for consolidation. On the Jewish race, which is so signal an example of this proposition, the popular writer, Mr. I. Zangwill is to contribute a paper. Some years ago the bugbear of Panislamism would have been regarded as a necessary subject; but it is now nearly forgotten, and while the Moslem states are engaged in internal wars, they show no desire to attack others. Similarly it is noticeable that the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente both embrace nations whose official religions are different; the political unions of Europe like those of the East are not coincident with religious groups. At some future Congress there may be more room given to the co-operation of religions; we are only at the commencement of

such an understanding. In lieu of this the subject of moral education from the racial point of view and inter-racial morality will be treated by specialists, the latter by Dr. Felix Adler himself.

The sixth cross-division takes us back to the first, which in some ways coincides with it. By a caste system is meant one wherein permanent inequality is the result of birth. The phrase is not properly applied where migration from class to class is easy; thus the peerage in this country does not constitute a caste, on the ground that entrance into it can be earned, and that a whole family are not peers. Slight, however, as is its resemblance to a caste system, the sentiment of the country appears to be against its continuing unmodified.

If the list of papers be examined, this subject, in the sense of the relation of ruling towards subject races and the converse will be found in one form or another to occupy a very large space in the deliberations. It seems clear that race and colour prejudice does not exist in this country in relation to Indians; for natives of India have been elected to parliament by metropolitan constituencies on several occasions, and one is now a member of the Privy Council; the feeling, if it exists, is to be found in the country where Indians are numerous and English few, yet the government is in the hands of the latter; and the same is believed to be the case in Egypt, where the English, though scarcely less powerful are in the background. Some writers declare that the race and colour prejudice is only between the governed and those who are actually governing; that it does not exist where the English are pursuing non-political vocations. Other writers deny that it exists among the natives except a small class, who do not so much resent the privileges of the ruling race as envy them; whereas the bulk of the population are satisfied that the duties of government should be performed by competent persons, but otherwise feel no respect for, or envy of, the governing class; the measure by which they ascribe superiority or inferiority being categorically different from that which the others apply. This, we saw, is the view to which Sister Nivedita lends her authority. The fact that this question occupies so much space in the Transactions appears to have suggested in some quarters suspicions that our purpose was revolutionary. This view is erroneous, because it is likely that very different opinions may be held by speakers with regard to the question. As Aristotle says, it is as much the interest of the

governed to be governed as it is that of the governor to govern. There may, of course, be speakers who take the view ascribed to John Stuart Mill, that if a nation does not govern itself, it has no government; yet it is unlikely that so untenable a proposition will find many supporters. For wherever life and property are protected, there is government; and it is to the interest of the governed that life and property should be protected. That European protection has introduced safety for life and property into countries which never before enjoyed it is a historical fact; that the withdrawal of that protection would be attended by serious danger to both is an opinion which may be erroneous, but is too widely held to be treated with contempt; but the case wherein a hundred thousand of one nationality are sufficient to maintain order among a hundred millions of another confronts us with that problem of race equality. If there were one Englishman left in India, according to an opinion current in that country during the Mutiny, he would be sufficient to regain the country for the British Empire; and the history of that extraordinary struggle shows that this was only a moderate exaggeration. The mere fact of being able to do this clearly by one standard gives (to use the same example) the Englishman a tremendous advantage over the nations whom he protects; and so long as the standard which those nations employ is not the same, so long as he and they are incommensurable, it is probable that no ill-feeling, no sense of humiliation need arise; any more than the passenger on a steamship is humiliated by having to obey the orders of the captain, or a patient resents the prescriptions of a physician. Further it should be observed that those who speak of these nations being deprived of their independence, a statement sometimes made by well-informed writers, are using a word which in such a context has no meaning. The difficulty then seems to occur when the races become commensurable; when the standards of the one nation come to be adopted by the other.

We have now gone through the main topics which the Universal Races Congress is to discuss. It would be imprudent to over-rate the effect of any such gathering of specialists or amateurs; a considerable amount of the advantage lies in its giving those who are working at the same subjects the opportunity of meeting and by personal intercourse getting to understand each other better, but some portion also is to be found in the favourable soil which it provides for the dissemination of fresh ideas. For definite suggestions time has been assigned in the final session, but it is

likely that some will be communicated at most of the sessions. One such, as will be seen, is the organization of a world-society for the encouragement of inter-racial amity: an idea which conceivably may be fruitful. In any case the idea itself of an assembly representing mankind kindles the imagination, and its realization on however humble a scale unquestionably marks a step in the forward direction. And the remarkable array of names which Mr. Spiller has been able to secure in approval of the scheme indicates on the part of persons whose services and experience give weight to their opinions a belief that the causes in which they have been and are still working may be furthered by it.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

SOME THOUGHTS ON DEMOCRACY.¹

It is my object in this paper to bring out some fundamental points with regard to the meaning and value of the democratic ideal. What I have to say will touch to a certain extent on several of the political problems of our time; but I will try, as far as possible, to avoid any statements of a partisan kind. Practical politicians, especially in the midst of elections—which have recently been rather too frequent—are forced to select proposals that can be immediately carried into effect, and are usually impelled to exaggerate their urgency and their finality, and to minimise the force of any arguments that may be brought against them. These evils are, to a certain extent, counteracted by their opponents; but it may be doubted whether the resultant of such conflicting tendencies is always in the direction that is most reasonable and right, even if we grant that it usually represents the best that is practicable at the moment. When, however, we “sit down in a cool hour,” undisturbed by the heat of party strife, and not over-anxious to see everything accomplished in a hurry, it ought to be possible for us to take a somewhat wider outlook, to recognise difficulties and dangers in a more dispassionate way, and thus to prepare ourselves to meet them more effectively in the future, when it becomes necessary once more to arm ourselves for the fight.

The importance of trying to understand Democracy at the present time is very apparent. The word is bandied about very freely among us; and, in some sense or other, it is more and more coming to be recognised as the dominant tendency in all those countries that are commonly described as civilized; and, indeed, in nearly all parts of the world the various countries seem to be approximating to a common civilization, which is largely based on principles of a democratic type. It is perhaps in some of the smaller countries, such as Switzerland, and in some of the younger colonies, such as Australia and New Zealand, that these democratic tendencies can be studied in their least diluted form; but to some extent we can trace them in every European country, in all parts of America, and even in recent times throughout Asia and Africa. In our own country, notwithstanding the strong tendency that

1. A lecture to an Ethical Society.

we have to cling to the traditions of the past—in many respects a very wholesome tendency—it can hardly be questioned that the influence of democratic ideals is constantly increasing. This influence is not confined to the sphere of imperial or local politics, but permeates our whole life, in industry, in education, in religion, in literature, and in every other province. In politics it is not confined to any party. If one party claims to represent the voice of the people, the opposite party at once professes that it is even more eager to listen to that voice. Some may doubt whether the claims thus put forward by any political party could be altogether justified. They may question the sincerity of those who state them; or, admitting their sincerity, they may suspect that the wishes of the people are not rightly interpreted by them, or that the methods that are proposed for giving effect to them have not been wisely chosen. With such doubts I am not here concerned. I am content to notice the general fact that all political parties tend to claim that they are the true representatives of the democratic spirit. Yet this does not result in any marked degree of harmony among them. Their agreement on this point is rather like the agreement of two people who both lay claim to the same estate. Now, it is not our business at present to try to settle these claims, but only to bring forward certain general considerations which may help us in the end to settle these claims and others of a similar kind.

One consideration naturally occurring at the outset is that with regard to the value of the estate thus claimed by these conflicting parties. Is Democracy, we may ask, so good a thing in itself as to justify all these eager claims to be regarded as its true exponent? On this point it must be borne in mind that there have never been wanting influential thinkers who have not displayed any desire to identify themselves with the democratic spirit. Nor can it be fairly said that such thinkers have usually been men who were deficient in social sympathy. Carlyle and Ruskin were among the most impassioned prophets of social reform; yet they were both strenuously opposed to what is commonly understood by democracy. Ibsen and Nietzsche may also be reckoned among social reformers in their own peculiar way; yet the wishes of the "compact majority" do not meet with much respect from the former, while the latter, in his remarkable vein of lyrico-philosophical extravagance, has taught us to aspire rather towards the evolution of the superman than towards the elevation of the race or the realization of its desires. And, in thinking of these, we

cannot well afford to overlook those older utterances,—deeper, saner, and more carefully balanced,—in which Plato and, in a less degree, Aristotle expressed their distrust of a pure Democracy. The reflective minds of our own generation are more and more turning to these, and believing that they find in them a wisdom that has been too long overlooked.

Now the views of these thinkers cannot be discussed with any thoroughness in such a paper as this. I can only indicate briefly what seems to me most important. What I wish more particularly to urge is that there are two main ways in which Democracy may be conceived and advocated; and that one of them is fully worthy of the reproaches that have been cast upon it by those to whom I have referred; while the other is quite deserving of all the admiration and devotion that have been bestowed upon it either in ancient or in modern times.

The first of these two ways of conceiving Democracy is that which proceeds from the belief that it is in itself desirable that every one's opinion on important public questions should be treated as of equal weight; and that the prevailing influence in practical affairs should be simply the resultant of the various opinions thus represented. Such a view, as I understand it, is a purely individualistic one. It treats society as a mere aggregate of the persons who compose it. Now, there are perhaps not very many at the present time who would profess adherence to this view, when it is thus formulated; but I believe there is a very considerable number of people who are more or less consciously influenced by it. It is what is meant, I suppose, when it is said that "the voice of the people is the voice of God"; and it is what is in the minds of those who are always eager to have a poll of the people on every important question.

Now, I believe this view of Democracy to be unsound; and it is against this view, as I think, that the contentions of such diverse writers as Plato and Aristotle, Carlyle and Ruskin, Ibsen and Nietzsche, have any force. Such a view, if pressed to its full extent, allows no special influence to the man of special insight. Its logical outcome would be an election by lot and decision by plebiscite; and I certainly think that this would lead in the end to the kind of chaos that is graphically described by Plato and Carlyle, and more dramatically ridiculed by Aristophanes and Ibsen.

But it is possible to interpret Democracy in a very different and, as I think, a very much truer and better way. The central principle of this second interpretation is that a human being is

not truly human, not in the full sense a person, unless and until his actions in all important matters are determined freely by his own individual choice. This does not mean, however, that his own choice is determined without reference to the views of others, or to the life of the whole within which he is included. But it means that he is to be regarded as a living part of that whole, not forced from without, like a piece of mechanism, but more and more understanding what he is doing, choosing what is appropriate, and realising himself in the fulfilment of his social ends. This is the view that corresponds to the organic conception of the social unity. Now, if we think of the individual as related in this way to the whole within which he lives, we must also think of that whole as allowing him, as far as possible, a free choice with regard to all the important aspects of its life. The extent of that choice must, however, depend, in some degree, upon his ripeness for it—i.e., upon the degree in which he is able to understand and appropriate what is most essential in the life of the whole. What this means in practice, it is not altogether easy to explain, and it is largely for this reason that it is not more generally recognised by practical men; but an illustration taken from a comparatively private affair may help to make it clear. I take an illustration from the practical arts, of the same type as those that have frequently been used by the critics of political methods since the time of Socrates.

What is our method of procedure in case of illness? It would not be very wise for any of us to decide in such a case, purely on the strength of our own private knowledge, what is the nature of our illness, or how it may best be dealt with; nor would it be very much wiser to attempt to arrive at a decision by an appeal to the opinions of the majority of our neighbours. In some oriental countries they adopt the plan of laying out the sick person in some public place, where he may have the benefit of the advice of everyone who passes; but this is done, I suppose, in the hope that some one who has special experience and knowledge may happen to pass. Among ourselves it is customary to adopt more direct methods for the discovery of such an expert. We do not trust to chance for his discovery; yet, on the other hand, most of us feel it to be somewhat unsatisfactory that the guidance of the expert should simply be forced upon us by some external authority. We like to have some voice in the selection of our expert; and we like also, as a rule, to have the advice of some of our neighbours in making our choice. But we do not attach an equal weight to

every piece of advice that is given to us. We are specially influenced by the opinions of those who have suffered from some similar illness, and who have made a satisfactory recovery; or of those whose judgment in practical matters is, on various grounds, specially valued by us. We generally make some allowance, moreover, for any prejudices that we may have reason to suspect our advisers of entertaining. Using the material that is thus at our disposal, we select the best medical expert who is available. Having selected him, however, we still continue to make some use of our individual judgment. We try to guide him in his diagnosis by any relevant facts that are known to us. We try also, as far as possible, to understand the view at which he arrives, and his grounds for forming it; and the nature of the results which he expects his remedies to achieve. And, if we find any reason for doubting what he tells us, we probably consider the advisability of calling in some other expert to consult with the first, or, in an extreme case, even to get rid of the first altogether. The method that we adopt is thus a combination of individual choice and expert guidance; and I believe it will be found that, in some form or other, this is the most satisfactory method in all practical affairs.

The social organism is a much more complex system than a human body; and the diseases from which it suffers are much harder to detect; and their treatment is made particularly difficult by the fact that one organism of this sort is never quite like any other, or even quite like itself in different stages of its growth. Hence the knowledge of the expert is apt to become more rapidly antiquated than is the case with the physicians of the body. Partly for this reason, there has always been some doubt on the question whether there are any people who can properly be described as experts at all in the treatment of political problems. And the very existence of such a doubt tends in some degree to justify itself. If wise guidance is not looked for, it is not very likely to be forthcoming. If we had not got into the habit—still, it must be confessed, somewhat imperfectly formed—of relying upon trained medical advisers, not many such advisers would be trained; and we might still have to resort to the practice of exposing the sick in public places for the counsel of those who pass. What happens in politics is somewhat similar. We doubt whether there are any expert advisers. We take very little pains to secure them. Hence it is, to a large extent, true that they are not produced in any considerable numbers; and that we are driven to the miserable expedient of consulting "the man in the street."

Yet it is not entirely true that there are no experts even now. There are certainly some people who make it their special business to bring a trained intelligence to bear upon the complex problems of our social and political life; and, if only we believed in them a little more, there would be more of them, and they would be better trained. The smallness of the output of skilled advisers, and the comparative insufficiency of their training, are largely due to our ingrained habit of believing that we shall be able to "muddle through" well enough without them. Distrust is both the parent and the child of inefficiency.

What I wish to urge, therefore, is that it is of great importance that we should believe that it is possible to have real physicians of the state as well as of the individual organism. If we believe in their possibility, and are constantly looking out for them, trying to secure their services, and to give them the best opportunities of preparation for their work, we shall soon find that they are forthcoming. No doubt, even when we find them, it is not desirable that they should be at liberty to treat the social body without any reference to the opinions or choice of the individuals who compose it; but neither is it desirable that these individuals should directly prescribe for it. They should rather choose their physicians, watch them, judge the correctness of their treatment by any evidence that may be available, and adopt measures in consequence. This seems to me to be the general principle. How it is to be applied is, of course, a much more difficult problem. But I am convinced that, if we bore the general principle steadily in our minds, the means of applying it in particular cases, as they arise from time to time, would readily suggest themselves. When men know what they are looking for, their eyes are wonderfully sharpened. Perhaps it may be some help, however, at this point, if I try to make my meaning more apparent by reference to some of the leading political problems of our time. I select three problems for this purpose—(1) the question with regard to the existence and functions of a Second Chamber; (2) the value of the Referendum; (3) the desirability of extending the political franchise to women. It is not my object to try to provide answers to the questions that are thus suggested, but only to indicate how the general principle that has been stated may be of assistance to us in looking for answers. The actual formulation of answers to them must be left to those who are experts in practical politics.

1. With regard to Second Chambers, the principle that has been laid down should help us to see both their desirability and

the limitations of their functions. Some of the statements that have recently been put forward with regard to their most important functions seem to me to be seriously misleading, and to depend on what I have described as the wrong conception of Democracy. It is frequently suggested that the chief value of a Second Chamber is that it enables us to delay legislation until we are quite sure that the people as a whole, or a decided majority of the people, desires it. Now, I think it must be admitted that this is sometimes a useful function. If we hold rigorously to the doctrine of the divine right of the majority to rule, it would appear to be the only useful function that such a body could fulfil. And indeed, if this were its only important function, it might not greatly matter whether the people who composed it had inherited political wisdom from their remote ancestors or had only inherited lands with somewhat questionable titles. But if we believe that other things, besides the wishes of the majority, are to be reckoned with in managing the affairs of nations; there may be functions of a more difficult and weighty kind that may fairly be required of such a body. It might be made to represent the more permanent elements of political experience and insight that a nation contains, as against the forces of conflicting interests, temporary passions, and momentary expediency. I can imagine a Second Chamber which should be really of the nature of a national Senate—an assembly of men (and, I should hope, of women too), of trained capacity and long service in the affairs of state, who should not be the representatives of this or that place, or of this or that special interest, but rather, standing aloof from all places and interests, should aim at making themselves the representatives of God on earth, the perpetual advocates of truth, justice, honour, and wisdom. There are surely such men to be found. The condition of our country would indeed be desperate if there were not. It is only necessary to devise some method for picking them out, and placing them in the position for which they are fitted. With the consideration of such methods we are not here concerned.

Of course I am well aware of the objections that would at once be brought forward to any such reform. An assembly of this kind, it is said, would have too much power, and would be able to override the wishes of the people. I quite recognise the force of this objection. Any body of men, however able and excellent, when too long seated in high position, is prone to become the slave of custom, unprogressive, inaccessible to the changing movements of the time. Even in the medical profession, to which I

have referred by way of illustration, a danger of this kind is not unknown; and in the larger affairs of the state it would be still more pernicious. Such a body might tend also to be rather too much under the influence of permanent officials. I would not urge, therefore, that even such an assembly as that to which I have referred should have any absolute veto on the wishes of the people as expressed through their elected representatives. But I certainly think that such an assembly might do much more than delay. It might also advise and guide; and surely we might safely trust that its counsels would not be altogether neglected. Have any of our political parties fully considered the possibility of establishing such an assembly as this? It would at any rate bring us nearer to what Plato meant by his conception of the philosopherring, and to what Carlyle meant by the rule of heroes. I doubt whether we ought to be ruled either by a philosopher or by a hero; but it would probably be well for us if we could be guided by the one and led by the other.

2. With regard to the Referendum, it seems pretty obvious at least that the grounds upon which it is most commonly advocated are connected with what I have been characterising as the wrong view of Democracy. It is a method of ascertaining, in a direct way, what the majority of the people want with respect to some particular question at a particular time. Now, there may be occasions upon which it is very desirable to do this. But I think it would be dangerous to commit ourselves to such an attempt as a general principle in politics; and I should fear that this is the direction in which the proposal would lead us. No doubt, if we believed that practical wisdom in political affairs is to be reached by the simple expedient of counting the number of people who advocate particular proposals, it would hardly be necessary to have any Government at all. At least it would exist only as an executive to carry out the behests of others. Besides this, we should only be in want of some elaborate machinery for formulating questions and counting answers. Now, there may be some questions affecting the life of a people that could be satisfactorily dealt with in this way. It is perhaps true that it is undesirable to carry out any large change in the constitution of the country without some direct assurance that the great mass of the people—or at any rate the great mass of those whom it would most vitally affect—is in its favour. But it would be hard to define the exact occasions on which this ought to be done, or the exact methods by which a reliable answer could be discovered. Again, there may be occa-

sions on which there is so much diversity of opinion among experts, and so little possibility of arriving at any agreement, that no really satisfactory judgment can be formed. In private life questions of this kind are sometimes settled by tossing up a coin; and the Referendum would at least be a little more scientific and a little more satisfactory than that method. But, in general, I believe it is by the method of discussion, by joint action, by give and take, by compromise on small points and expert opinion on those that are more weighty, and by the enthusiasm and determination of men of strong convictions, that the more important issues in a nation's life are and ought to be determined. Now, the Referendum is not an instrument upon which such forces could readily be brought to bear. It is too purely arithmetical and mechanical. I am far from denying, however, that on certain clearly defined issues it might sometimes be worth while to resort to it. But I think it should be regarded as an extreme medicine; and it should be remembered that, like many medicines, it contains what may prove to be a dangerous poison.

3. The question of the extension of the parliamentary franchise to women is also one that is frequently argued on the basis of the individualistic conception of Democracy. Certainly it is on this basis that the case for it can be most triumphantly established. If we believe that the voice of the people is the voice of God, there would seem to be no particular reason for supposing that the voice of women is any less divine than that of men. If, on the other hand, we believe that the affairs of the state ought to be under the guidance of experts, the case is not quite so easily decided. Arguments might then be brought up against the proposed extension. It might be urged, for instance, that the conditions of women's lives do not in general furnish them with many opportunities for gaining a large experience in the affairs of state or for developing those habits of practical decision on complex and impersonal issues which are essential in political life. It is hard indeed, to see how, even on such grounds as these, it would be possible to justify the complete exclusion of women from any direct voice in public affairs. The utmost that could in this way be established would be the desirability that certain limits should be set to the extent of their participation. The general arguments in favour of Democracy would still apply. The considerations, in particular, that make it important that every citizen should have a living part in the activities of the whole would seem to be quite as applicable to women as to men. Nor would more special argu-

ments in their favour be lacking. For there are certainly some important questions—such as those relating to the work of women themselves, to the care and education of young children, to household economy, and to the general interests of family life—in which women have considerably better opportunities than men of gaining a large experience and of forming sound judgments. On such questions many women would rightly be regarded as experts. In general, moreover, it seems desirable that large public questions should be viewed on every side; and the women's side—which would also, I suppose, be, to a considerable extent, the children's side—appears to be in most cases one of real importance, even when it is not the dominating issue. Hence, quite apart from the questionable individualistic doctrine of equality of rights, it hardly seems possible to deny that women have a strong claim to a share of a direct kind in the government of the country.

It would only be when the question arose with regard to the exact nature of this share that any doubt could well be entertained. It is here, I believe, that the real difficulty of the problem lies. On the general legitimacy of the claim that is put forward there is not, so far as I am aware, much difference of opinion. There are not many, at least in this country, who connect the franchise with military service, and who justify the exclusion of women from the one on the ground of their exemption from the other—an argument that is often used in countries of a more military type. What is chiefly felt by most men as an objection is the consideration that, though many arguments can be brought forward for giving women *some* share in the nation's government, it is doubtful whether they should have a preponderating share or even a share that is equal to that of men. This is one of the cases in which the faith of many is shaken in the doctrine of pure equality; just as it often is in countries that are inhabited by diverse races at very different stages of development. Doubts of this kind do not of course imply any particular theories with regard to the general equality or inequality of the sexes. They rest rather on the recognition that the problems with which most women are specially qualified by their experience to deal judiciously are on the whole not the largest and most contentious part of the problems with which nations are concerned—especially nations that have far-reaching imperial interests at stake. This is a difficulty that is, I think, recognised by a good many women as well as men; and it is especially hard to meet by those who are committed to the general doctrine of the simple enumeration of votes as the

only sound political method. Those who are not committed to this doctrine, on the other hand, have many means of escape. They may suggest—as is done by the supporters of what is called the Conciliation Bill—that the conditions on which the vote is granted to women need not be absolutely the same as that on which it is granted to men. The basis of the municipal franchise may be adopted; or the qualifying age may be made different. Or, again, a scheme might easily be devised by which women should have special representatives of their own in Parliament for the express purpose of attending to their particular interests and of pressing forward the questions in which they are more intimately concerned; and these might sit for larger constituencies, and be consequently fewer in number. Nor do such proposals as these—which might present considerable difficulties, both theoretical and practical—exhaust the resources of those who are not committed to an individualistic system of Democracy. For it is not true now, and it need not ever be true, that it is simple majorities that decide the most important issues. Wisdom, experience, energy, disinterestedness, impartiality, still count for something in the influence that men wield in the affairs of state; and we may reasonably hope that they will always continue to have weight. If it is found that, on the whole, women bring less of these qualities than men do to bear on public problems, we may be confident, I think, that their influence on the settlement of such problems would continue to be less, whatever the number of their votes might be. They would not be placed in as many of the higher offices, and their opinions would not draw as much support; nor would they have as many seats in that national Senate to which I have referred as the ideal Second Chamber for the future. Hence it may be urged, even from the point of view of the more limited conception of Democracy, that the fears entertained by some, that the admission of women to the franchise, on equal terms with men, would render the conduct of public affairs less strong, wise, and constant than it is at present, are probably without foundation; and ought not to be allowed to stand in the way of a demand which, on general grounds, is obviously reasonable. But all this depends on the supposition that government is not to be carried on by a simple poll of the people. It depends on the supposition that the rule of the Democracy, like the rule of most modern kings, is to be constitutional and not absolute.

I have referred to these various points, as you will readily perceive, not with the object of advocating any particular schemes,

or of supporting the policy of any particular party, but rather with the view of illustrating the distinction between different conceptions of Democracy. I think it is really of great importance at the present time to have in our minds a clear view of what we mean by Democracy, and of the sense in which it may be regarded as a true ideal for human life; and that then we should try, in any ways that lie in our power, to work towards the realization of it both in our national life and in the smaller spheres of our local institutions. It is, to a considerable extent, true that Democracy is at present standing at the parting of the ways; and it would hardly be possible to exaggerate the gravity of the issues that are at stake in deciding whether we are to take the upward or the downward path. But what is chiefly important is not that we should have any ready-made schemes for the carrying out of our ideas, but rather that we should clearly understand the direction in which we wish to move. Our salvation is not to be found in the manipulation of machinery, but in the enlightenment of opinion. If we are steadfastly looking in the right direction, we are pretty sure to find our way.

J. S. MACKENZIE.

THINGS ONE EXPECTED OF A SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

It may perhaps be held an act of ungraciousness to lodge a deliberate criticism and complaint against a body so noble of intention as one realises the London Sociological Society to be. On the other hand, it might be maintained that there could be no flattery so great as the confidence which such a proceeding implies. Be this as it will, as one who has waited ever since the foundation of the Society for the elucidation by it of certain urgent problems, and month after month met only with disappointment, I beg herewith to present my indictment.

The name of the Society and the honoured names of many on its lists had led one to believe that it would consist not merely of "members," entirely discrete, and unrelated to one another, writing interesting disquisitions for each other's benefit on scattered matters of observation, but of a compact body of thinkers and workers—a little "company of faithful people"—who, however few, would be brought together by a common aim, a united purpose, a single hope. That they recognised the importance of Sociology amongst the sciences seemed to be an earnest of the fact that they would labour to bring about a social way of regarding economic and political life. It seemed to promise that they realised the value to all of the full development of each, that in short they were prepared to consider the difficulties in the way of the moral transformation of the world. I must frankly say that up to the present I have been uniformly disappointed in my hope of seeing this synthetic idea emerge. As a worker who had looked for help, and still believes that it may be available, I write this note.

The outstanding phenomenon of the present age for English people is undoubtedly the existence of empire. Sociologists may be assumed to be persons who are not quite intoxicated with vanity, but are aware of many of the dangers and difficulties which empire involves, both for rulers and ruled, and are prepared to consider these facts in a calm and unprejudiced manner, with a view to the determination and perhaps even the promulgation of true ideas on the subject. How to breed the best varieties of the ruling race, in its more comfortable classes, seems after all only a minor and provincial topic as compared to the question of whether it is

possible to evolve a supremely social—because cosmic—national life, in which the highest results of every separate evolution shall be at the disposal of all.

In my own intellectual life, few influences have been so fertilising as that of the Le Play-Geddes theory of the six fundamental civilisations,—those of shepherd, peasant, fisher, hunter, forester, and miner. As a corollary upon this theory follows the *dictum* that true evolutionary progression of humanity is only possible by a return upon and re-enforcement of each of these factors separately. Is this true? And how may it be done? What are the essentials of each of these civilisations, and how have the facts of history been determined by them? Consequently, in what line would the true development of different societies lie?

One deduction from this conception would be an adequate classification of the characteristics and differentiae of the modern period. In what exactly does "being modern" consist? What is the essence of the distinction between modern and mediæval? In what special activities lies the higher significance of each of these periods? What achievements are possible to human beings to-day that never were possible before, and why? What was the correspondingly highest attainment of a previous age? On what facts did such a possibility rest? Why is the same thing not generally accessible to-day? One of the things for which our need is most imperative is some such examination and analysis, more or less adequate, of to-day, enabling us to think clearly and not altogether falsely about that civilisation of inter-communication and artificial distribution, of the idleness of middle-class women, and uncultured workmanship, in which we find ourselves. Such a description would enable us to find our way amongst the conceptions that underlie empire, and might perhaps enable us to place our own life-efforts in due relaxation to the great whole.

One phenomenon that may be observed in the East is that of the incidence of a financial upon non-financial civilisations, and its manifold effects. Here one may learn from unmistakeable evidence that money is not wealth, that money is not even food. To a Sociological Society one looks for the elucidation of the great question—What is wealth? What are the essential marks of popular well-being? What proportion of the total activities of a people may be safely devoted to pursuits related to commerce? To what extent ought there, in the interests of society itself, to be a rigid taboo upon all such?

If the practical is not to be altogether anathema to a body

of students, another matter that may be brought to the notice of a Sociological Society is the difference between races and nations, between history and ethnology, between place and kindred, as factors in social evolution. An examination of the differing educational potentialities of theocracies and nationalities, and some notice of contemporary tendencies in the distant parts of the earth towards an exchange of types in this respect, might not be out of place.

Again, why should a Sociological Society not point out and put on record the modernising emancipation contained for Mohammedan peoples in such movements as Behai-ism? Why should China and the little nations of mixed types in Further India be unheard of? It is the duty of the scholar surely to unify all observation. Why should the English sociologist know nothing of what the Frenchman is discovering in Cambodia, or the Dutchman in Java? He will learn these things, assuredly nowhere else, if not in his Sociological Society. The different social values of Roman law and Custom-law want examination. To whom should we look for this?

Empire implies synthesis. What are the duties and what may be the reasonable ambitions of a synthetising people? What have been the special achievements of the empires of the past? What are the nobler opportunities of the empires of the present? On all these matters we want true thought. It is not the business of a group of students to initiate organised practical efforts, but it is their duty and their right to attempt to arrive at true ideas on their own type of question. And having reached this, the rest may be left to follow of itself. True thought is obviously the greatest power in the world. How many, at work on the world's moral and social frontiers, are accessible to the thought that streams out from your central group? How important then to us, that the actual pressing problems of the day should not be ignored amongst you!

NIVEDITA, OF R.K.-V.

TWO COMMENTS ON THE FOREGOING.

I. BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S COUNCIL.

MUCH of Sister Nivedita's severe criticism consists in charging the Sociological Society with not concerning itself directly and sufficiently with the Art of Social Reform. How far it will be considered an adequate reply to say that the Society is engaged in developing the Science rather than the Art of Society, will perhaps partly depend upon the question how far this or any other science

can, or ought to, be pursued in a disinterested manner, *i.e.*, for the sake of knowing. But even those who hold that the form and substance of every science, and perhaps peculiarly of the "moral" sciences, must be determined by the arts to whose service the knowledge when acquired will be placed, may well admit that in a study where so much research and classification, even of an elementary character, requires to be done, it would be bad economy to plunge at once into a large exposition of the Social Art in relation to such immensely important practical problems as those of empire. I agree that a Sociological Society ought by its inquiries to "throw light" upon most of the issues which Sister Nivedita raises, and even to "elucidate" the question "What is Wealth?" and the related questions which she names; but the Science of Society cannot furnish answers to these questions in the sense of formulating a programme of social conduct for an individual, a nation, or the human race. It may be a better economy of our intellectual resources, in the earlier stages of collecting and stating laws of social forms and forces, not to concern ourselves too closely or too clearly with the practical uses to which the knowledge may be put, when it is got. In that way we may get a more reliable sort of knowledge, which when it has been got may be applied by social reformers to the art of social progress as this is interpreted by each reformer. This pursuit of a "disinterested study" I consider quite consistent with the view that the evolution of such a science will, and shall, be largely determined by the requirements of the art, in the sense that the questions and hypotheses by means of which a science proceeds will in reality be suggested by the human purposes (other than that of mere knowing) to the furtherance of which the knowledge will be applied. In this qualified sense I am a pragmatist. Perhaps the Sociological Society may not have taken sufficiently into account these other "human purposes," *i.e.*, may have pretended to be more "disinterested" than it can or ought to seek to be. If so, some of Sister Nivedita's criticisms may get home.

J. A. HOBSON.

II. BY THE LATE HON. SECRETARY OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE foregoing criticism of the Sociological Society may be read as an indictment also of the science of Sociology. In both respects it seems to me there is much truth and relevance in what Sister Nivedita says. And we ought to be duly grateful to her, for friendly criticism of this kind should be of the greatest value to us, both as members of the Sociological Society and as sociologists. This revelation of disappointed hopes following on the establishment of the Society might easily be paralleled in the history of the science. Students of Herbert Spencer have experienced disappointment, for example, in their expectations of what his sociology was going to do for the Japanese, who were supposed to rely to some extent upon him for guidance in their great transition. We remember, too, that Spencer himself in the last years of his life was saddened, and even a little embittered, by the apparent

reversion of Western Europe to militarism in the teeth of his sociological forecast of the industrial trend. Seemingly his sociology was somewhere defective in affording, certainly no prediction, and apparently no explanation of such reversion to a previous phase of culture. Then, again, recall Comte's expectations that sociology would gain a rapid influence in public affairs by winning adherents among women and the working classes. There is no need to cite the impassioned predictions of Condorcet and other early founders.

Undue optimism on the part of leaders and founders is, of course, a normal phenomenon. But is there not some defect, if not in the science itself, at least in its cultivators, which we must invoke to explain the comparative sterility of sociology in this the third generation after its admission to the circle of the sciences? Let us recall the statement of purpose set forth at the initiation of the Sociological Society:—

The aims of the Society are scientific, educational and practical. It seeks to promote investigation, and to advance education in the social sciences in their various aspects and applications. It aims at affording a common ground on which workers from all fields and schools concerned with social phenomena may meet—economist and historian, psychologist and moralist, anthropologist and archæologist, geographer and naturalist; as also physician and alienist, criminologist and jurist, hygienist and educationist, philanthropist and social reformer, politician and cleric.

Note especially the Society's aim at bringing together workers from all fields and schools concerned with social phenomena. How far has it hitherto effected this purpose? A glance at the membership roll shows that it does include economists and historians, psychologists and moralists, anthropologists and archæologists, geographers and naturalists; as also physicians and alienists, criminologists and jurists, hygienists and educationists, philanthropists and social reformers, politicians and clerics. A glance at its publications shows that representatives of all these groups have contributed to its papers and discussions. But the question is, how far have they participated in a real co-operation? What is the test of real co-operation? Is it not the subordination of individual preference to joint and common purpose? Has the Society generated amongst its members the thrill of a common enterprise; or has it merely now and again gathered together manifold representatives for some temporary common end? These are questions which members of the Society in general, and of the Council in particular, should put to themselves. And if there is a feeling that we have fallen short in synthetic ideals, how can we amend our ways?

What possibility is there of putting before sociologists a common enterprise in which each participant would feel that he was contributing something to one great social purpose? In short how can the Society correlate, vitalize and unify its members? With that purpose, what definitive tasks and problems can it set before itself? Is there not here, in the endeavour to find the answer to these and similar questions, scope for those Research Meetings of the Society, which, though part of the original plan on which the Society was established, have not yet in any effective

way materialised? The research of synthesis, the investigation of co-ordination, the planning of co-operative investigation—these are surely as legitimate objects of organized research as the sporadic problems of sectional investigators. And if organized research of synthesis is not pursued in a Sociological Society, where is one to look for it in a world divided mainly between those who wish to maintain archaic syntheses inviolate, and the fools who have said in their heart, there is no Unity?

Behind the question—What is wrong with sociologists and the Sociological Society? lies the deeper question—What is wrong with society itself? May not these two questions be but different forms of the same question? Sociological science, like all other sciences and their respective societies and associations, is a social product of the time and epoch, reflecting alike its qualities and defects. Are not indeed those shortcomings of the Sociological Society which Sister Nivedita singles out, the very characteristics which make our contemporary occidental society so fertile in personal initiative, sectional amelioration and material progress, so sterile in unifying these partial achievements into collective spiritual uplift and concerted social advance?

The Sociological Society is apparently too faithful a reflex of its social milieu! But how diagnose clearly and in detail the common disorder of parent and offspring? The Society affords "a common ground on which workers from all fields and schools concerned with social phenomena may meet." Let us think for a moment of these manifold students of social phenomena as being mainly of two kinds. There are, first, those who might be called sectional specialists and experts—those whose knowledge and experience have been derived mainly from concentration on some particular part of our field of study. These are the "economists and historians, psychologists and moralists, anthropologists and archaeologists, geographers and naturalists; as also the physicians and alienists, criminologists and jurists, hygienists and educationists, philanthropists and social reformers, politicians and clerics" of our enumeration above. Then next, in a class apart from the sectional specialists and experts, are the few members of our Society who, though, maybe, distinguished students in some sectional department, have yet made it their specialism to survey and systematize with the aid of synthetic formulæ the whole of the sociological field. From these—let us call them synthetic specialists in contrast to their brother sectional specialists—we should expect the plans of those concerted campaigns of research in which all students would co-operate. But these plans, if they exist, where are they to be found; where the synthetic conceptions to indoctrinate the sectional specialists, where the human ideals to animate them, where the divisional leaders to organize these specialists into efficient brigades in the sociological army? Where should we look for these requisites? Scarcely amongst those philosophical synthetists who are sceptical towards the traditional body of sociological generalizations, and who look forward to the development of the science with hope for the future, mitigated by suspicion of the present. Leaving these aside, there are two large groups of active working sociologists—for the name sociologist should in strictness be

reserved for the synthetic students of the science. The oldest, most impressive, and best organised group is, of course, the Comtists—those who see social progress as an ever-continuing historical procession of “Grands Initiés,” great and noble souls—a true apostolic succession of priest and prophet, sage, saint and hero—inspired by the ideals of human service and linked by the filiation of human institutions. The other great group of synthetic sociologists—the disciples and continuators of Le Play—see the Great Man as himself just the most skilful workman rising literally out of the working class by larger and finer experience of place and work, and therefore the natural and necessary leaders in the earth struggle for mastery of environment. It is clear that these two great synthetic schools are complementary and not antagonistic—the one historical, idealistic and aristocratic, the other geographical, determinist, and democratic. The tragedy of recent sociology would seem to be the failure of Spencer—the most synthetic mind of his time—to realize this truth, with its implied task of continuing and unifying the twofold inheritance of synthetic sociology. Spencer was apparently unacquainted with the work of Le Play, and deeply misunderstood that of Comte. But the task creates the man; and the line of synthetic succession is seldom interrupted for long. It is the special service of Professor Geddes to Sociology that he has laboured for unity. Sister Nivedita makes her acknowledgments to what she quite accurately calls the “Le Play-Geddes theory of the six fundamental civilisations.” It is quite true that Professor Geddes has continued the observations of Le Play, developing his formulæ into a theory of social origins, and deducing therefrom some precepts of social renewal. But to speak of the “Le Play-Geddes theory of the six fundamental civilisations” is no adequate characterisation, even of the papers which Professor Geddes has contributed to the publications of the Sociological Society. Such characterisation is misleading, since it concentrates attention on the geographic and economic aspects of the doctrine set forth in these papers. It fails to recognise another equally large and vital aspect: their psychological and historical analyses and re-syntheses. These were based on Comte’s theory of historic filiation and his analysis of social functions—the latter so little known and used that recent recoveries of it in vague and fragmentary form pass current as independent discoveries of social psychology!

To be sure, the explicit purpose of Professor Geddes’s numerous papers on Civics in the publications of the Society was the modest one of claiming for sociology an observational and concrete basis, in the study of cities. But this implied an exposition of method and an assembling of resources, which, to those acquainted with the recent history of scientific thought, made it clear that Professor Geddes had reached a working unification of the two synthetic schools of sociology—and that this had been achieved in the only way possible, *i.e.*, by developing each of them along the lines marked out by the sociological specialisms that have mainly grown up subsequent to Comte and Le Play, and further by some re-orientation to those preliminary but still magistral sciences which have undergone so profound a modification in the past and present generation—*viz.*, biology and psychology.

Thus the answer to Sister Nivedita is a general one. Her case is typical. Her queries, if we generalise them, are those of the representative student of sociology. As observer amid the bewildering detail of contemporary social life, what is he to look for and where? In the complexity of process in the human hive, how, he asks, does it work in detail and in totality? In the drift and eddy, the backwater and cross-currents of the social ebb and flow, how discern the whither, how trace out the whence? What resources of organised knowledge, of provisional hypothesis, of tested theory? Where is this apparatus of research to be found and how utilized? What clear vision is obtainable of the past and the present of the social organism in its unity; what clear discernment of the opening future, its actualities and possibilities, its lurking dangers, its latent ideals?

Faced with these problems the student is apt to be inhibited rather than encouraged by the vast and expanding accumulations of all the sociological specialisms, unless these are seen to lie in orderly fashion within the orientation of a unifying theory. If, then, it be maintained that the Comte-Le Play-Geddes set of formulæ does constitute the framework of such a unifying theory of social evolution, how explain its limited usage by students of the science? Partly because it has been published only in summary and abstract; partly because sociologists themselves are so generally deficient in the needful preparation of the preliminary sciences and the history of the factors of civilisation—and for many other reasons, some of which will suggest themselves. But there is one supreme obstacle to the wide utilisation of any theory of social evolution which is "scientific," in the sense of detachment from the partisan interests of the practical life, and yet verifiable by reference thereto. It is this. There is implicit in every "ism" of political and economic parties, of religious and social bodies, a set of conceptions as to the "is," the "has been" and the "ought to be" of social relations: in short, every group is an empirical school of sociology. And before he may pass the *pons asinorum* that separates empiricism from applied science, the student must purge himself of partisan bias. But how? To be sure all the resources both of the Temporal and the Spiritual Power are needed; for the setting up and working of the purging and purificatory ritual. Statesmanship no less than sociological theory must be invoked. The task of statesmanship is to organise conflicting groups into that social co-operation we call the nation, and these again into the higher grades of ascending internationalism. It is the problem of sociology to harmonise discordant conceptions of social life into such unified spiritual power as can sustain, guide, and expand the co-operative groupings of the practical world. It is clear that these two great objectives of humanity are but the theory and practice, the science and art, of one and the same thing. It follows that the science and the art, the theory and the practice of social life must develop together and in mutual understanding. The student's theory can only grow in truth and largeness as it is earned by the student's participation in the evolving social life. Correspondingly, the statesman's capacity for the organisation of co-operative activity

will be limited by his grasp of theory. The categorical imperative of sociology would seem to be that the student must be a statesman, the statesman a student, and both citizens. Grant this and the Sociological Society has its objective defined by the assertion that it is an organised grouping to replace empirical groping for the detailed "How."

V. V. BRANFORD.

The criticisms made and the questions stated or implied by Sister Nivedita (Miss Margaret Noble) will be recognised as of especial interest to all students of social science and social tendencies, and they lend themselves to debate from many points of view other than those from which the subject is approached by Mr. Hobson and Mr. Branford. We shall be glad therefore to continue the discussion in the next number of the Review, and in doing so to make room as far as possible for contributions from members of the Society and others interested in the subject. Contributors are asked to be brief, and to aim at definiteness alike in criticism and suggestion.—EDITOR, *Sociological Review*.

NOTES.

Le Bulletin Mensuel of the Solvay Institute shows continuous improvement. The mere catalogue of the additions to the library, which used to appear at the end, was replaced in February by bibliographies arranged under the names of all the sciences comprised in sociology, and containing references to important books not acquired for the library, as well as to those which the directors have thought it necessary to purchase. These bibliographies are immediately preceded by the notes and news of the month relative to the subjects they concern. Any student of sociology, therefore, who wishes to know what his contemporaries are doing in his particular province, will only have to turn to his page in the *Bulletin*, and he will be able to survey the field in two or three minutes. M. Menzerath's admirable bibliographies, with annotations, for psychologists, will no longer be published in the *Bulletin*, but they will be printed still for the benefit of members of the psychology group of the Institute, and of outsiders who make application for them. The Report for 1910 appears in the February number. It is a record of enterprise and organisation that every sociologist ought to read, giving special attention to "The Sociological Intermediary," which puts the workers in the various fields of sociology into communication with one another, and which, were it more widely known, would altogether prevent the duplication and overlapping of work which is often so disappointing to those who have spent a lifetime in research.

The Cities and Town-planning Exhibition, after its notably successful stay in Edinburgh, has been on view during June and the first part of July in Dublin, where it formed part of an important Health Exhibition organised under the direction of the Countess of Aberdeen. Mr. Mears and his assistants added to the already existing collection a large number of plans, prints, and drawings illustrating the development of Dublin, these being supplemented by a panoramic view of the city painted by Mr. Eric Robertson, whose pictures of Edinburgh were among the most striking things shown at Crosby Hall and the Royal Scottish Academy. As at Edinburgh the services of guides and lecturers were secured, Professor Geddes being present for a part of the time and delivering several lectures. By special request the Dublin Exhibition was kept open a fortnight beyond the date originally announced, and the public interest aroused by it has taken practical shape in the formation of a cities and town-planning committee, and of a department of town study in connection with the Irish National Museum. Arrangements are now in progress for the transfer of the Exhibition to Belfast, whence in all probability it will go, before the end of the summer, to another Scottish city.

Membership of the Universal Races Congress, to be held at the end of the current month, is open at the reduced subscription of 12/6 (instead of a guinea) to members of the Sociological Society, as of other societies,

provided that the number of those joining is not less than six. This condition will certainly be fulfilled in the case of the Sociological Society, and members wishing to take advantage of the concession are asked to send in their names to the Hon. Secretary. The final arrangements for the Congress are now being carried through. At the first session, on July 26, the President, Lord Weardale, will be in the chair, and the discussion will be opened by Dr. Brajendranath Seal, of Bengal. The chairman at the second session will be Mrs. Pember Reeves, and the opener Dr. Margoliouth. Lord Avebury presides over the third session, which is to be opened by Mr. J. M. Robertson. Sir Sydney Olivier presides over the fourth, to be opened by Mr. J. A. Hobson. At the fifth session the chair will be occupied by Sir Harry Johnston, the opener being Dr. Felix Adler. Sir Charles Bruce will preside over, and Sir Harry Johnston open, the sixth session. Dr. T. A. Walker opens the seventh, and Dr. Sophie Bryant the eighth and concluding session, over which Lord Weardale is to preside.

The work of Ruskin College, Oxford, is, we are glad to see, making good progress under Dr. Gilbert Slater, who was recently elected to the Council of the Sociological Society. This year twelve students entered for the examination for the diploma in Economics and Political Science of Oxford University. All passed, no less than eight out of the twelve receiving distinction. Of the other students passing the examination four members of Oxford University and one independent student satisfied the examiners. It will thus be seen that Ruskin College secured as great a total number of passes in this examination as the whole University, and twice as many distinctions.

REVIEWS.

COMTE'S EARLY ESSAYS.

"Early Essays in Social Philosophy." Translated from the French of AUGUSTE COMTE by HENRY DIX HUTTON. A new edition with additional notes and with an introduction by FREDERIC HARRISON. Routledge. New Universal Library. 1/- net.

COMTE'S Early Essays, which mark a decisive step in the development of Sociology, are here presented to English readers—for the first time in a convenient form.* In the second essay, written when he was only twenty-two, Comte distinguishes between the movements of destruction and construction that together characterise the period since the end of the Middle Age, and contrasts the course of events in England and France. In the third, at the age of twenty-four, he creates the new science to which he afterwards gave the name of Sociology—that is he maps out its field and characterises its method. In the fourth and fifth he asserts the need of philosophers in an age of specialists. A long line of thinkers from Aristotle to Adam Smith had recognised that Division of Labour lay at the base of civilisation. To the economists the continual increase of this Division was full of hope for the future. Comte saw that it was inevitable and fully admitted its advantages. But he perceived its disadvantages also. Each individual, nay each nation, may be best employed in doing that which each can do best; but all the greater is the need that the general interest shall not be forgotten as the sphere of each is narrowed. The unity of mankind must be preached to the nations; and within each nation, there must be temporal government to enforce the general good, there must be spiritual leaders to keep social aims and aspirations before the people. The more necessary scientific specialism becomes to scientific progress, the more is the need of scientific philosophers to co-ordinate these dispersive efforts. The last essay is biological rather than sociological. It is a review of a work by Broussais, warmly supporting that writer's contention that Psychology must be based on Physiology, and, indeed, going rather further than modern Psychologists in distrust of introspection. Incidentally, however, it makes clear the distinction between Sociology and Biology, and shows how much light a study of social evolution can throw on some of the problems of Psychology.

The third essay is entitled "Plan of the Scientific Operations Necessary for Re-organising Society." It was set as a task by Saint-Simon, who was anxious to obtain the scientific knowledge required for the social re-organisation he contemplated. Saint-Simon proposed a series of investigations having an immediate practical end. Comte set out to fulfil his wishes, and produced instead a treatise on Sociology—an abstract science which like other sciences could be made the basis of practical applications, but which itself was independent of the purposes to which it might be applied, and rested on the previous scientific progress of Man. The difference was similar to that between the study of lines and angles

* As I took some small part in preparing the new edition for the press, I confine my remarks to the original work.

for the purposes of land measurement and the science of geometry. The master was the first to perceive that the disciple had—without recognising it—passed outside his school. Instead of offering receipts for use in the organisation of a Saint-Simonian state, he was helping to found the science of Sociology. But though he thus separated Theory and Practice, and sought the laws of social development, instead of the means of social improvement, it was not merely to satisfy human curiosity. He recognised that right action must be based on knowledge, and he looked forward to the time when Sociology would afford a basis for social reconstruction. He sought the true only as truth, but when he had found it, he intended to use it as a means of human well-being. This which appears over and over again in these essays is a complete answer to the charge that his later career was inconsistent with his earlier. He laboriously built up the philosophy of the sciences and traced the evolution of human civilisation in order that at the end, he might fulfil the aspirations of his youth and use the results of his toil for the increase of the well-being of mankind.

Comte even in his youth spoke with decision. He carefully elaborated his theses before he put them forward, and they, therefore, to superficial readers have an air of finality which their author was far from claiming for them; for he on many occasions withdrew from conclusions that further investigations showed to be doubtful. Here, however, we for once can see Comte actually searching before our eyes. A name for the new science had still to be found. Aristotle's "Politics" remained as the chief work of the Ancients on social organisation, Bacon had foreshadowed a possible science "Politic" to which his method could be applied, and one of the treatises of Hobbes is called "De Cive," while Vico had given no special name to the "Nuova Scienza," and the other Sociologists of the eighteenth century had scarcely recognised their subject as a separate science. It is, therefore, not surprising that Comte at first thought of calling the science "Politics," "Theoretical" or more commonly, "Positive Politics," to distinguish it from "Practical Politics," the corresponding art. But the expression had two great objections. It confused, after the manner of Saint-Simon, the science with the practical ends it might serve, or rather one of the practical ends; for more than one art may correspond to a science—the truths of Biology may be useful to both the physician and the breeder. It employed a term "Politics" which was in common use, and therefore of indefinite connotation. It savoured too much of the market-place. He next tried "Social Science." This was a decided improvement, but was still open to objection, since the words taken separately were in common use, and even together were hardly distinctive. Nevertheless, it has been accepted by Le Play and his followers. Then he proposed "Social Physics"—The physics of social phenomena, corresponding to the physics of celestial and terrestrial phenomena. But Physics was already in use, without an adjective, as a name for one great section of the scientific field. To bring the nomenclature of all the sciences into line, it would have been necessary to re-name Chemistry, "Molecular Physics," and perhaps Physiology, "The Physics of Living Phenomena." It was not till some years after the first publication of these Essays, that the introduction of Biology as a general name for the science of life, suggested to Comte the advantage of creating a new name for social science. The name he proposed has been objected to because of its mongrel origin. This Comte defended, since it was the

result of the combination of Greek science and Roman polity. Whether this be a good defence or not, the word Sociology has survived the criticism, has been accepted by Herbert Spencer, the greatest of the English Sociologists, and has given its name to our society and to this review.

At the time when Comte began to write, two opposite errors divided the public. Those who believed that social phenomena were subject to natural law, believed that human intervention was impossible or noxious; the others thought that society could be moulded at the will of the legislator, and that there was a perfect organisation which if it could only be found, would be the best for every time and every people. Comte sought to know the laws of social development in order that he might be able to use that knowledge for the advantage of men. The goodness of any social arrangement depended on its fitness to the particular stage of civilisation reached. As he conceived it Sociology must be based on induction, on "direct observation of the phenomena relative to the collective development of the human race." For this it was necessary for Imagination, supreme in the earlier stages of the human evolution, to be subordinated to Observation. This transition with an intermediate and connecting stage, is found in the history of all sciences, and constitutes the three states through which each passes. This is the Law of the Three States which misunderstood by some as relating to three distinct *eras*, and criticised by others because of Comte's choice of terms "Theological, Metaphysical, Positive," has been seriously impugned only by arguments that would deny the possibility of law in Sociology. Each can follow it out for himself in the history of every science. Some, indeed, have imagined that Comte repudiated all other laws in Sociology. This is a patent absurdity, for he put forward others himself. What he did say, was that the more general laws, the main current, must be followed first, and the modifications due to special circumstances considered after, just as in Astronomy, the perturbations were neglected till the laws of the planetary movements had been discovered. For the later stages of civilisation, "climate," the particular environment, must be subordinate to the general movement of civilisation. It is thus that the work of Le Play came properly after the work of Comte. So far from being a rival system, it is really a study of those modifications the full meaning of which can only be understood when the general human development—Vico's "Ideal History"—is known. It is especially in tracing this social evolution, the filiation of the ages, that Comte's contribution to Sociology consists.

S. H. SWINNY.

ADOLESCENCE.

"The Adolescent." By J. W. SLAUGHTER, Ph.D. Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. 2/6 net.

DR. SLAUGHTER'S little book on the Adolescent makes a strong appeal both to the thought and to the imagination of anyone really interested in the education of children. It is delightfully stimulating, sometimes even provoking. It is full of characteristic thrusts at hallowed conventions and all the incrustations of prejudice with which we elders arm ourselves when forced to face the problems of adolescence. And yet—or may I say therefore?—it is thoroughly sane as well as packed full of suggestion. Also, it is delightfully short; its hundred pages are in pleasing contrast

to Stanley Hall's two stout volumes; it is not marred by any unnecessary physiological detail; and it is generally free from obscure terminology. I say "generally," because here and there the reader is needlessly assaulted by such terms as maturation and nubility, which I venture to think are not wanted.

Dr. Slaughter begins with a very clear account of the physical and psychical changes by which adolescence is marked; he then describes the most important emotional and mental characteristics of the adolescent, such as adolescent love, idealism, religious fervour and doubt; giving valuable hints concerning the treatment of each; he then proceeds to explain the pathology of adolescence, noting the commonest forms of nervous disorder, and the appropriate hygienic treatment; and finally, after a chapter on juvenile crime, he sums up his conclusions in two chapters on the education of boys and girls. If any part of the book should be picked out for the special attention of parents and teachers, it is these two last chapters. They are perhaps a little too negative, but that is probably inevitable. They are certainly calculated to compel reflection upon the traditional methods of education which most of us accept just because they are established.

I have, however, three criticisms to make. First,—though I confess this is a matter of personal opinion,—the writer seems to me to be very unfair on religion and its function. "In broad interpretation," he says, "religion may be taken as the expression of the communitary consciousness." It is permissible to urge that, unless a broader and deeper interpretation than this be taken, religion cannot be made to perform its most important function even for the young. And Dr. Slaughter's treatment of this part of his subject seems thin simply because he appears to consider religion merely as a form of distilled social experience.

Secondly, in the very vital matter of education, the treatment, though most stimulating and suggestive, is marred by one grave defect. The writer accepts two dominant aims or ends: an educational system must on the one hand harmonise with the physical and psychical needs of adolescent development; it must on the other hand be adapted to the requirements of adult life. Now these two aims very plainly conflict. The needs of adolescence are on the whole in flat opposition to the demands of adult life, and no system of education can satisfy both. The adolescent needs plenty of play, the direction of new impulses towards big and inspiring objects, the "long circuiting" of nascent but very powerful interests, and an absence of monotonous "grind." But adult life demands before all else the discipline of steady attention to detail, close concentration upon uninspiring things, curbing of the free play of imagination, short circuiting of many interests which tend to roam far afield, and above all plenty of grind. Added to this there remains the fact that the requirements of ordinary life consist largely of *acquirements*, most of which are determined by the general social and industrial setting approved by the community; and these seldom have any relation at all to the needs of adolescence. It follows that all arguments such as Dr. Slaughter's, which have an eye to both sets of requirements, lead to contradictions, and fail to convince us. Dr. Slaughter's criticisms of the traditional British Public School are often valuable, no doubt. But he does not really offer us a coherent alternative, nor ever will, unless he discards the greater part of one or the other of the two aims which he accepts. And if we are to have an admitted compromise, then some sort of case may be made

out for these imperfect institutions which he holds up to ridicule. Their class curriculum is said to teach nothing useful for adult life; that is exactly what the physiologist generally approves. Does not Dr. Slaughter say it is criminal to teach a child under 7 to read,—although ability to read is one of the great requirements of its immediate after-life? Certainly the Public School does not teach much in the way of acquirements; but at least its curriculum provides discipline, control, and attention to uninteresting detail; and, by leaving the boys' voluntary interests to develop themselves out of school in games and the immediate hero worship that goes with them it gives excellent opportunity for the needs of adolescent development to be met naturally.

Lastly, I cannot help giving expression to a personal grievance. Dr. Slaughter's ten chapters suggest that they were written as a course of lectures to young teachers. Perhaps that is why he never really lets himself go. Those who know him will not be satisfied until he shakes off any lecture trammels, and writes—at greater length—exactly what he thinks and feels on the subjects which he has made his own.

E. J. URWICK.

THE RUSTIC-URBAN REVIVAL.

"The Rural Life Problem of the United States." By SIR HORACE PLUNKETT. Macmillan, 1910. 5/- net.

THE current transition from traditional political view-points to evolutionary social ones is clearly expressed at the very outset of this vigorous little book: "A reconstruction of rural life in English-speaking communities is essential to the progress of Western Civilisation." Wholesomely awakening too, to complacent Englishman and Scot, each brought up from earliest childhood to thank God that he is not as these Irishmen, is it to read: "I claim with some pride that in thought upon rural economy Ireland is ahead of any English-speaking country." And as we read on, we find Plunkett and Roosevelt in high converse and generous rivalry in that uplift of rustic life—"better farming, better business, better living," which our economic and social leaders in Great Britain are as yet so slow to overtake. The indebtedness of both statesmen to the United States forester, Gifford Pinchot, is generously recognised, not only for a new policy of natural conservation of the great asset of the remaining forests, but for the corresponding moral and social outlook as well. Sir Horace adds kindred praise to the public appeals of Mr. James J. Hill, addressed to American farmers, for stopping the waste of soil fertility by "the application of the physical sciences to the practice, and of economic science to the business of farming." From all this the step is made to a fresh criticism of our familiar thought-world of urban politics and affairs—the demand for "a complete change in the whole attitude of public opinion towards the old question of town and country." "For many decades we, the English-speaking peoples, have been unconsciously guilty of having gravely neglected one side and perhaps the most important side of Western civilisation." The origin and consequences of rural neglect are analysed in an excellent chapter, peculiarly to be recommended for the treatment of the self-sufficiency of our predominant types of urban politician, while two chapters on "The Inner Life of the American Farmer," and "The Weak Spot in American Rural Economy"

exhibit our author's educational vigour in application to the rustic mind. The distinctive contrasts of urban and rustic, both psychological and practical, are broadly and unsparingly outlined, and the whole illuminated by examples from experience, mainly Irish and American, though at times English and Scottish.

From his life of agricultural and co-operative endeavour Sir Horace Plunkett has taught himself no small amount of real and concrete sociology. The dreary abstractional world in which we wrangle or bombinate of "Individual and State" has for him practically ceased to exist; of the dubious metaphor of the "social organism" and the like he has as good as never heard, while for the ingenious subtleties or solemn nonsense of rival schools of economists or ethicists he cares as little as any of his brother farmers. Hence he never dreams of himself as a sociologist. Yet he has recovered that physiocratic point of view from which political economy arose, from which it has too long wandered; but to which—with conservation policies and the like—it returns, as physical economics and social energetics. And while the concrete sociologist at his best is as yet for the most part exploring the manners and customs of Australians or other simplest races, is exhuming and deciphering the records of buried cities, or at most interpreting the developments or delineations of our own, Sir Horace Plunkett has found his way ahead, and is re-discovering for us the long-lost nexus of country and town by actually re-organising its renewal. Living the peasant's life more fully and effectively, because more helpfully and generously, than any other man of his generation, there has been coming back to him not a little of the old agricultural wisdom—even the yet older feeling of nature and poetry of the earth; so that the shrewd and homely formula which runs through his pages like a refrain—"better farming, better business, better living"—applies to all aspects of place, work, and folk, and means not merely more abundant livelihood, but more abundant life. "What is needed is a comprehensive knowledge of public affairs, political imagination, an understanding sympathy with, and a philosophic insight into, the entire life of communities. . . . The situation demands two things: on the one hand an association, popular, propagandist, organising; on the other an institute, scientific, philosophic, research-making." Here, on the one hand, is a vision of rustic-urban renewal; on the other of the reorganised and applied sociological thought which such renewal at once needs and aids. The transition noted at the outset as in progress, from political oratory and strife to social action and thought, is in this homely and practical booklet fully exemplified. It is now for us more professed sociologists to take up its mingled lead and challenge, and to work out more completely throughout our whole land that renewed survey and interpretation of social phenomena, rustic and urban—say rather urban-rustic and rustic-urban—which on every page it demands, suggests, or inspires.

PATRICK GEDDES.

"TABOO AND THE PERILS OF THE SOUL." By J. G. Frazer, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Professor of Social Anthropology in the University of Liverpool. London: Macmillan & Co. 1911. 10/- net.

As a begonia leaf when stuck in the ground will develop into a new plant, so each chapter of *The Golden Bough* is acquiring an independent exist-

ence as a separate volume. Now we welcome the re-birth of chapter ii, "The Perils of the Soul," of the second edition (1900) of the *G.B. as Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, and its 232 pages have increased to 425. The enlargement of the book is due to interstitial growth; the framework is the same, the data are retained, but everywhere new illustrative matter is added. Professor Frazer casts his vast net very widely and the mesh is so small that practically nothing escapes it; thus we find that the additions date from the year 1900 and are world-wide in their origin. It seems presumptuous to point out fresh examples to Professor Frazer, but I venture to draw his attention to the two following: A Kayan of Borneo when he is ill believes that his soul has escaped, when he recovers it is supposed that his soul has returned to him; to prevent its departure on some future occasion the man will "tie it in" by fastening round his wrist a piece of string on which is threaded an antique *lukut* bead (Hose and Shelford, J. A. I., 1906, p. 65). Cushing draws attention to the break or "exit trail" that occurs in the encircling lines which decorated ancient and modern Pueblo pottery; a pot is a "Made Being," "the clang of a pot when it breaks or suddenly cracks in burning is the cry of this being as it escapes or separates from the vessel. . . If the encircling lines inside of the eating bowl, outside of the water jar, were closed, there would be no exit trail for this invisible source of life, or for its influence or breath." (*Fourth Ann. Rep. Bur. Ethnol*, 1882-83, [1886], pp. 510, 511).

The argument and the conclusions of the earlier work are usually repeated verbatim and consequently there is no need for a formal criticism, which indeed is met by the author's statement that the present book does not profess to handle the subject as a whole, but treats of the principles of taboo in their special application to sacred personages such as kings and priests. The earlier edition suffered from the defect that it was difficult to pick out the general conclusions from the examples and in order to follow the argument recourse had to be made to the Contents; in the present edition the sub-headings to the chapters and especially the marginal notes make the book much easier to read and greatly increase its utility.

The following subjects are dealt with: The burden of royalty, including royal and priestly taboos, and the divorce of the spiritual from the temporal power. The perils of the soul, with sections on the soul as a mannikin, the absence and recall of the soul, and the soul as a shadow and a reflection. The tabooed acts include taboos on intercourse with strangers, eating and drinking, shewing the face, quitting the house, and leaving food over. The tabooed persons are chiefs and kings, mourners, women at menstruation and childbirth, warriors, manslayers, hunters and fishers. Numerous tabooed objects and words are referred to, and in the last chapter Professor Frazer loyally acknowledges "our debt to the savage"—"our gratitude is due to nameless and forgotten toilers, whose patient thought and active exertions have largely made us what we are . . . reflection and enquiry should satisfy us that to our predecessors we are indebted for much of what we thought most our own, and that their errors were not wilful extravagances or the ravings of insanity, but simply hypotheses, justifiable as such at the time when they were propounded, but which fuller experience has proved to be inadequate. . . After all, what we call truth is only the hypothesis which is found to work best."

A. C. HADDON.

"The Nāga Tribes of Manipur." By T. C. Hodson. Published under the authority of the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam. Macmillan & Co., London, 1911. 8/6 net.

THE volume on the Nāga tribes of Manipur is the fifth of the series of excellent small monographs on Assam produced under the authority of the Government. These books are valuable alike to the Government Official and to all those who have personal dealings with the natives, as well as to students of ethnology. Mr. Hodson had a long and honourable connection with the State of Manipur and is thoroughly competent for the task entrusted to him; the notes by Lieut.-Col. J. Shakespear are also of great value. The book deals with the physical appearance, origin, dress, ornaments, etc. of the people, their domestic life, laws and customs, religion and folk-tales.

Villages and clans once lived in a state of constant feud, but "the great solvent of these feelings is trade, and . . . the most enterprising among them . . . now take to commercial instead of bellicose activities" (p. 8). All are agriculturists, but the plough is not in use. Mr. Hodson gives a very interesting account of the methods of rice-cultivation employed. Six Tangkhul villages make a speciality of cloth-weaving, which is done "by the women alone and the six villages as far as possible prevent their girls from marrying into a village where the industry is not practised. In this way a 'Clothworkers' Guild' is in process of formation. . . ." (p. 47).

The author has collected a great deal of valuable information on the laws, customs and beliefs of the Nāgas. Relationship is reckoned only through males, and the clans are exogamous. It is significant, however, that, among the northern and eastern Tangkhuls who tattoo their women, a girl often repairs to the house of her mother's brother for the process, which is "a pre-nuptial, and therefore to some extent an initiatory rite" (p. 31). "The household is a true social unit, as is proved by the fact that the head of the family has to perform certain religious duties in reference to the House Deity, . . . the area of whose influence is strictly bounded by the limits of the eaves of the house and the noonday shadow" (p. 70). Among the Tangkhuls "on the marriage of a son the parents are dispossessed of the bulk of their property and required to evacuate, if not the whole, at least the best part of the house," a custom extending "to the tenure of village offices out of which it probably originated" (p. 71). There is no conception of tribal solidarity, but a rule obtains which forbids the intermarriage of persons whose language proves them to be of different tribes—a convenient enough regulation. The village is nearly always the unit for the operation of the *genna*, or temporary tabu. The objects of religious rites are exclusively social, and the village priest acts as representative of the community when performing ceremonies.

Mr. Hodson acknowledged the difficulty of thinking "Nāga," but he contrives to give a very lucid and sympathetic account of native beliefs and religious practices. Those relating to death are admirably dealt with, and sociologists will be indebted to him for his description of the *gennas* imposed for various purposes. Implicit confidence is placed in dreams and omens; a familiar note is struck when we find the domestic cat figuring as a portent. In the law-courts her rôle is an important one, for quarrels between villages or clans are decided by the oath on the cat. But space will not allow us to wander further into the fascinating realm of animal beliefs.

A. C. HADDON.

"Nigerian Studies." By R. E. DENNETT. Macmillan & Co. London. 1910. 8/6 net.

WEST AFRICA in general, and Nigeria in particular, is an Eldorado for the anthropologist, and a book from one who combines a love for anthropological research with the powers and opportunities of an administrator in that region cannot fail to be interesting. Mr. Dennett, who has already given us a volume "At the Back of the Black Man's Mind," is Deputy Conservator of Forests in Southern Nigeria, and has not hesitated to avail himself of the co-operation of the educated native, the priests and the chiefs of the people whose customs and lore he has investigated on the spot from native sources to present to the sociologists of Britain. Administrators and missionaries are sometimes blamed for adopting methods not exactly suited to the uplifting of the negro race, and it has been urged upon the Colonial Office from time to time that Sociology should be made a compulsory subject for those who are sent as British officials to Negro and Oriental lands; but, as the author points out in his preface, "the construction of a correct native policy is much harder to build up, and it is a question whether we yet have sufficient data to work with any certainty."

The book opens with a short account of the history of Yoruba as we know it, as well as from a native point of view. Mr. Dennett quotes a native view that the Yoruba people having customs similar to those of Asiatic races, and many natives being found with semi-Syrian or Arabic features point to an Asiatic origin. The author himself half supports and half combats this view. He recognises, indeed, that "many natives ignore the fact that the country was peopled by pagan Africans," but thinks that "the marked superiority of the Yoruba people to their neighbours certainly points to something of the sort." We cannot ourselves discover the slightest pretext for this belief, the Semitic words in their language, the customs, and possibly also any similarity of feature being traceable to the Mussulman missionary efforts and domination.

The author next describes a legend of creation which leads on to an account of the Sacred Stones at Ife. Briefly, the story is that the world was made by two people, man and wife, named Yemuhu and Orishala, who were accompanied to the world by a female person Ajajuno, who was made by no one and whose duty it was to fight the world. After creation Yemuhu and Orishala turned to stone and are to be seen at Ife to-day. What became of Ajajuno is not stated; but it is interesting to note that the discordant, superhuman, and fighting element was of the feminine gender, and that in mentioning the two Creators, the woman has precedence. Strangely enough the author passes it without comment; but he is quick to trace the phallic nature and rites in the worship of the stones which takes place here. In the description of the secret societies of the Oro, which, in many ways, closely correspond to the "Poro" described by Mr. Alldridge in his "Sherbro and the Hinterland," other anthropologists may also discern traces of the ancient phallus worship.

The chapters on death, burial and the departed spirits convey a vivid idea of the importance which ancestor worship still plays in parts of our empire. Religious and political guilds abound in Yoruba, and a man's rank is estimated by the number of guilds of which he is a member. Apart from presents of cattle, yams, oil, goats, and other provisions for maintaining the whole of the members of the guild, there are the

etutu or propitiatory sacrifices for the dead. Whatever amount remains after the necessary expenses are paid is distributed among the members, and every individual is given a portion in proportion to his official status. "There is no native," says the author, "but belongs to one or another of these guilds. The enjoyment of this benefit is regarded as an accumulated debt for every individual and imposes an obligation upon their children to make similar contributions to the guild towards their parents' funerals at their deaths." Very illustrative and suggestive is his description of the Ogboni guild which is also a political society from whom the King's Cabinet is always chosen. The corpse of such a member is laid with full masonic rites. In the old days for a woman to see their procession or their drum meant death, but a few elderly women were admitted, thereby precluding themselves from marriage.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the book is the absence of any theory which the author might seek to prove, unless we accept as a theory his first sentence in the concluding chapter: "By the fear of death and the desire to propagate and live, the Yoruba's thoughts were driven to the study in nature of the phenomena that caused death, or helped him to love and propagate." The author has rather set out to collect facts than to advance propositions. This, while securing the book from criticism, renders it no less acceptable to the sociologist.

H. O. NEWLAND.

"A Comparative Study of the Play Activities of Adult Savages and Civilized Children." By L. ESTELLE APPLETON, Ph.D. University of Chicago Press. 1910. 54 cents.

DR. L. ESTELLE APPLETON'S inquiry leads to the practical question whether the culture-epoch theory should be utilised in pedagogy. In other words, whether the child actually recapitulates the history of the race and should therefore be surrounded by the culture products and in some measure by the conditions of primitive peoples, at stages of mental development resembling its own. As a curriculum founded on this theory is just beginning to make its appearance in this country in some of the more progressive schools, fresh light on the matter is of especial value. The study of play activities, being an unworked field, is chosen as a basis for this investigation. Five tribes of the simplest possible type are selected from the five zones and the various games of each are scheduled under the headings Somatic type, Psychological type, and Organisation. The plays and games of civilized children are treated in a similar manner and the results of both studies are compared. Further, the plays and games of children, as noted at the five periods of development included between the ages of one year and twenty-three years, are listed and the results again compared with the charts of the play activities of savages. Dr. Appleton's conclusion is that "although a similarity certainly exists between the play of the child race and the child individual, especially with respect to somatic characteristics, yet a process of differentiation has been going on throughout the cultural period which has profoundly modified, not only the final product, *i.e.*, the product found in civilisation, but also all the intervening stages." She contends that the task of education is "to learn to know the type." Incidentally Dr. Appleton arrives at what she terms the biological theory of play—a theory differing from Spencer's doctrine of excess of energy, from Groos's anticipatory

theory, and from Stanley Hall's explanation by inheritance. Thereby it is suggested that play is a reaction to stimulus and determined by the stage of development which the growing body has reached, the theory being based on the fact disclosed by the investigation that the play of civilised children "just keeps pace with the type of somatic growth." A drawback to the pamphlet is the non-publication of the charts from which the conclusions are drawn, but this omission will be remedied on the appearance of the author's more comprehensive work on the subject. An interesting and useful bibliography on this little-worked study is given.

L. Y.

"The Emancipation of English Women." By W. LYON BLEASE. London: Constable & Co. 6/- net.

Mr. Lyon Blease's theme is the struggle of Englishwomen for their emancipation from the end of the seventeenth century, at which time, he says, their condition in England seems to have been at its worst. Many readers will doubtless regret that, before entering upon the story of the feeble and fragmentary efforts of the eighteenth century, the author should not have described in somewhat fuller outline the position of women in Renaissance England and the changes wrought during the Elizabethan epoch and the age of Puritanism. He begins his examination of the modern movement with the earliest proposals for women's education—for example, Defoe and Mary Astell—and he provides many pages of delightful reading when he comes to the exposition of eighteenth century notions as to the woman's rightful sphere. It is long since one has come across anything more entertaining in its way than the chapter on "The Education of Sentiment," with its quotations from Dr. Gregory's "Legacy to his Daughters," Bennet's "Strictures on Female Education," and other admired treatises of the period. Coming to the later time, Mr. Blease retells at some length the story of the agitation against the Contagious Diseases Acts, and of the pioneer medical women. His chapters on the woman suffrage movement give in convenient form an account of the movement since the first parliamentary petition, presented by John Stuart Mill in 1866, together with a vigorous discussion of anti-suffrage arguments, and a defence of the measures employed by the younger suffrage organisations since 1906. Mr. Blease is an impassioned advocate, who makes no claim to impartiality. His enthusiasm for the feminist doctrine has not, he thinks, led him astray from the strict duty of the historian. That may be; but we are of opinion that the book would have gained much if the author had not restricted himself to the activities—in education and politics—of upper-class women, but had given attention also to social and economic forces. Mr. Blease, however, is entitled to reply that he did not set himself the task of writing a sociological essay. The book, in any case, is excellently written, and, despite its constant railing at male arrogance and egoism, it breathes a fine and generous spirit. The bibliography, though by no means complete, is serviceable.

"A Short History of Women's Rights." By EUGENE A. HECKER. G. P. Putman's Sons, 1910.

Mr. Hecker, like Mr. Lyon Blease, writes as a zealous advocate of the cause, and he attempts to cover a far wider field than his English

confrère. Beginning with a chapter on the rights of women under the Roman law, he goes on to examine the position of women among the Germanic peoples: then gives a glance at the canon law, summarizes (very inadequately) the movement in England, and, finally, deals with the history of women's rights in the United States. The most practically useful part of the book is a summary of the facts relating to the present position of women under the law in every State of the American Union. The facts thus tabulated relate to population, the age of legal consent, the law of divorce, the rights of married women in respect of property and control of children, labour laws, the suffrage, and industrial and professional status.

"Natural and Social Morals." By CARVETH READ, M.A. London: A. & C. BLACK. 1909. Pp. xxv+314. 7/6 net.

MR. CARVETH READ has written this work in the belief that the future of ethical science lies with the historical method, or rather with a method which may broadly be called inductive, using wherever possible statistical data, going back wherever possible to origins, and taking account continually of physical and physiological causes. Historical inquiry would seem to be admirably suited to Mr. Read's gifts of quick sympathy, imagination, and devotion to truth and fact. Many of the details and suggestions which he has gleaned from his studies of history possess great interest, and are, in their way, of very great importance; and in spite of the impression of fragmentariness and impetuosity which the book leaves on the mind, one cannot but recognise that he possesses in a high degree the faculty and habit of synthesis. Still, the main tendency of the work is critical, and its conclusions negative. Its value as a contribution to ethical thought will be found, I believe, to reside, not, as the author thinks, in its vindication of the ethical methods which he prefers, but in the virile judgment which he, as a son of the nineteenth century and a representative of the liberalism of his country, has brought to bear on moral problems. And he will be distinguished from the philosophers whom he so smartly criticises, not as the successful advocate of a new systematic treatment of those problems, but as having been in general clearer-headed than they. I am compelled regretfully to qualify the very high praise which I would fain give to a book full of interest and charm by observing that the author's grasp of the economic structure of contemporary society seems feeble, and that the attitude which he assumes towards the movement of the workers towards their emancipation is distant and out-of-date. Mr Read is much impressed indeed by proposals to improve the human stock by the regulation of marriage and breeding, but he despairs of their adoption by a perverse generation. As illustrating the author's best qualities, I may refer to his discussion of reward and punishment (pp. 198—207) and of slavery in the following section.

W. J. ROBERTS.

"The Future of Trades-Unionism and Capitalism in a Democracy." By CHARLES W. ELIOT, LL.D. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1910.

THIS remarkably trenchant little book, by the President-Emeritus of Harvard, contains the two Larwill lectures for 1909. In the first, dealing with the future of trade-unionism, there is a deal of hard-hitting against

nearly all the practices of the unions. The limitation of apprentices and hostility to trade schools, the boycott of non-union men and goods, the resistance to encroachment on one another's fields of labour, the limitation of output, the minimum day and the minimum wage—all are condemned by Dr. Eliot as essentially "monopolistic," some of them as degrading or as survivals of the fighting times of trade-unionism. The minimum wage in particular is denounced. It is opposed to the joy of work and of ambition; it stands squarely in the way of the successful artisan; it is wholly undemocratic, because "a true democracy means endless variety of capacity freely developed and appropriately rewarded." Dr. Eliot admits the excellence of much union activity, but he insists that "it is high time it should be generally understood that trades-unionism in important respects works against the very best effects of democracy." It is possible that, on a few points, the intelligent trade unionist might agree with Dr. Eliot, but there is no doubt as to the nature of the reply he would make to the attack on the policy of the minimum wage. Granted, he would say, that "democracy means endless variety of capacity freely developed"; but it must be upon the established basis of a minimum standard of existence for every worker. In the second lecture, on the future of capitalism, Dr. Eliot states, as one of the most far-reaching ideals of democracy, "the ideal of an improving lot throughout life for every faithful workman and good citizen." "And democratic society," he adds, "will insist that capital shall promote it, and advance toward it in all its dealings with labour." His outlook is far more hopeful than that of some other observers in America, for he believes that "capital, when under intelligent direction, is likely to share the democratic interest in the welfare of the mass of the population." Both lectures are full of provocative things, stated with a fine lucidity and vigour of style—a most striking contrast to much of the writing on economic subjects by younger Americans. But why, we wonder, should a writer of Dr. Eliot's authority always speak of "trades-unionism" and "trades unions"? The terms had a meaning in Robert Owen's time, when the aim was to form a union of the trades, but they are both inaccurate and misleading to-day.

"The Party System." By HILAIRE BELLOC and CECIL CHESTERTON.
 London: Stephen Swift, 1911. 3/6 net.

REPRESENTATIVE institutions have come in for so much hostile criticism in recent years that a thorough-going assault upon the party system was obviously overdue. And Mr. Belloc was as obviously the man to do it, although those who are aware of his large historical knowledge and skill in dialectics might reasonably have looked for a more serious production than the book which, with the help of Mr. Cecil Chesterton, he has, so to say, thrown off. It has undoubtedly had an effect on public opinion, but the effect, we imagine, would have been far greater if the authors had adopted a less extravagant and cynical tone. The attack follows the lines made familiar by Mr. Belloc's speeches and, less happily, by his political novels. The representation of the electorate, under existing conditions, is a sham; the House of Commons has lost every vestige not only of independence but of initiative as well; the Cabinet decides everything, and it decides as the mouthpiece of a "committee for which no official name exists (for it works in secret), but which may be roughly called 'the

Front Benches.' This is "the governing group." Its members belong to the same class, have identical interests, visit in the same set, intermarry freely and are connected all round by the ties of relationship. Their political antagonism is make-believe; they are playing a game which is determined by one thing alone—the demand for a tolerably equal division of the spoils. Add to this the scandal of the secret party funds, the control of elections by the caucus, the constant pressure upon all governments of international finance, and the indictment is complete. As for practicable remedies, the authors think nothing of electoral reform and little of the probable results of paying members and election expenses, while a law providing for the auditing of party funds would in their opinion be a dead letter. They suggest the election of Parliament for a short fixed period (four years at the most), the House to be indissoluble within that period. They support the proposal that the Ministry with its collective responsibility should be abolished and replaced by departmental committees of the House. They regard the Referendum and Initiative as instruments of incalculable value—provided that the people develop a sufficiently alert sense to make their initiative a reality. Finally, they would exact from every parliamentary candidate a pledge that he would vote against the government, whatever its composition, unless the measures to which members stood committed were carried through the House of Commons within a stated time. It is interesting to note that the authors hold in its simplest form the belief of the early English Radicals that an elected representative is a delegate merely, sent up to vote in every matter as his constituents direct.

"Ferdinand Lassalle." By GEORGE BRANDES. London: W. Heinemann, 1911. 6/- net.

It is close upon forty years since Dr. Brandes published the first draft of his essay on Lassalle. It met with remarkable success in Germany, where many thousand copies were sold, and enjoyed considerable circulation in other countries of Northern Europe. The preface to the book as it now appears in English is dated 1881, at which date the author noted the reappearance of Lassalle's programme in the form of German State Socialism, and therefore its special interest as one of the burning questions of the day. The study, however is of a much broader character than this reference in the preface would suggest. Brandes is pre-eminently a sociological critic, and he points out, in the chapter devoted to Lassalle's work on Heraclitus, that "almost all of Lassalle's writings contain some protest against the habit of considering separate sciences or departments of knowledge in irrational isolation, and in this point the inherent width and universality of his outlook may be seen." He goes on to remark that Lassalle, at the outset of his study of Heraclitus, laid emphasis upon the now familiar view that since history is no longer considered to be a mere collection of interesting or farcical incidents, and since the idea is regarded as an historical product and the history of philosophy as the uninterrupted development of thought, so the time could not be far distant when the history of philosophy would no longer be treated as an isolated department of knowledge any more than the history of art, constitutional history, or the history of social forms of life. But, in spite of this excellent piece of sociological doctrine, we are warned not to assume that Lassalle had at that time become any less Hegelian than he was at the

beginning or had actually arrived at the modern standpoint. Dr. Brandes treats his subject in two divisions—Lassalle before the agitation and Lassalle as an agitator: the first part being devoted mainly to an exposition of his general ideas, the second to an account of his activities from 1862 to 1864, "embracing the whole of that part of his work which has made his name known throughout Europe." Into these two last years, says Dr. Brandes, he seems almost to have concentrated the exertions of ten years. His death, in the duel of August 1864, is one of the most distressing tragedies of the modern world. Dr. Brandes' book is by far the best accessible study of its subject and it should find a large number of readers in this country. The publisher, or translator, has put on the flyleaf a quite unnecessary note referring to Meredith's picture of Alvan in "The Tragic Comedians." It is surely time that the English reader should be allowed to get at the real man and his work without the intervention of an imaginative creation which, after all, has no relevance whatever to Lassalle's place in European history.

"Reminiscences and Letters of Joseph and Arnold Toynbee." Edited by GERTRUDE TOYNBEE. London: H. J. Glaisher. 2/6 net.

MISS TOYNBEE'S object in compiling these letters and reminiscences has been to present the characters of her father and brother on the private and domestic rather than the intellectual side. Joseph Toynbee was an eminent aurist, whose life at the time covered by the letters was divided between his consulting room in town and the house at Wimbledon where his children grew up. His outlook upon life in general and education in particular was one of liberal orthodoxy, and he was on terms of friendship with most of the leaders of his day. The spiritual development of his son Arnold, who stands as so complete a representative of certain social ideals since embodied in collective action, is indicated with great clearness in his own letters and in others which Miss Toynbee gives from some of his friends. The longest and perhaps the most interesting of all is one written by James Hinton to Arnold Toynbee, when the latter was only nineteen. It is not difficult to understand, with the aid of documents such as this, how great was the grief felt by all those who had recognised his remarkable promise when death claimed Arnold Toynbee, in 1883, before the completion of his thirty-first year.

THE CAMBRIDGE MANUALS.

THE Cambridge University Press has undertaken a commendable enterprise in the series of Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature, edited by Dr. P. Giles and Mr. A. C. Seward, and published at a shilling net. They are intended primarily for school use or for young beginners, and we assume that the aim of the editors will be to make the series cover all the principal divisions of the field of modern knowledge. The volumes already issued include the following:—

"English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day." W. W. Skeat.

"The Idea of God in Early Religions." F. B. Jevons.

"The Administration of Justice in Criminal Matters." G. G. Alexander.

"Cash and Credit." D. A. Barker.

"The English Puritans." John Brown.

"The Coming of Evolution." J. W. Judd.

"An Introduction to Experimental Psychology." C. S. Myers.

Mr. Doncaster's little book on heredity in the light of recent research was reviewed in our last number. The manuals, so far as we have examined them, fulfil admirably the purposes for which they are designed; they should be assured of a wide popular welcome.

THE HOME UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

A further instalment of ten volumes of the Home University Library (Williams and Norgate) is sent to us just as we go to press. We hope to give in our next number a comprehensive review of this excellent series; for the present we are able to mention only four in this second batch, all by prominent members of the Sociological Society. Mr. J. A. Hobson writes on "The Science of Wealth," Dr. Leslie Mackenzie on "Health and Disease," and Professor Hobhouse on "Liberalism," while Professors Geddes and Thomson are found once again in collaboration over a little book on "Evolution."

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

FRENCH.

Several numbers of a small forty-page periodical entitled *L'INDÉPENDANCE*, which began its career in March, have reached the office of the Sociological Society. The subscription is 12 francs a year, and it is published twice a month under the editorship of M. Jean Variot, with the advisory help of MM. Emile Baumann, René Benjamin, Vincent D'Indy, Paul Jamot, Ernest Laurent, Emile Moselly, Georges Sorel, and Jérôme and Jean Tharaud. It is concerned for the most part with French literature and history, but although its independence sometimes amounts to rudeness that is anything but sociological, it presents the facts and problems of these branches of learning from the standpoint of the sociologist. In the number dated April 15th, M. Georges Sorel shows how university professors write minutely analytic books that are unintelligible to the people at large, and then call themselves "producers," by way of ingratiating themselves into the favour of a public which believes in nothing but economic socialism. M. Jamot, again, in the same issue, demonstrates, under the heading, *Theories and Works of Art*, that the warring schools of thought to which the creative artist appears to give rise, are really the work of their followers alone. The classicism and the romanticism about which they quarrel are both represented in every great work of art, and therefore the imposing principles for which people fight and hate each other are delusions. M. Gustave le Bon, in the first June number, elaborates his doctrine that knowledge is quite a recent discovery, whereas belief has ruled men since the beginning of the world and will govern them to the end. "Intelligence is progressive, but sentiments are unchangeable."

LA REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE for March contains a clever summing up, by M. René Worms, of the discussions on progress and evolution to which the meetings of the Paris Sociological Society have been devoted since November. He argues that our valuations of the organic as superior to the inorganic kingdom, and of sentient life as better than vegetative, are not scientific but purely subjective. They are the outcome of the will to live and of our gratuitous faith in ourselves. The conception of progress ought to give rise, therefore, not to speculation, but to action—action which, founded on correct estimates of other people's faith in themselves and ideas of what constitutes progress, will progressively achieve the well-being of every human creature.

In the April number M. Guillaume de Tarde gives an exposition of the views of the late M. Gabriel de Tarde on the subject. True to the optimism of *Les lois de l'imitation*, he presents the evolution, or rather the evolutions or transformations, of society, not as a Spencerian movement of growth, culmination, and decline, but as a continuous advance, through the interplay of imitation, or the conservative, and invention, or the adventurous spirit, to a social harmony which, far from being tame and monotonous, will comprise "an inexhaustible luxury of differences" in character and ability.

The larger part of the space in these two numbers is given to translated extracts from Professor Mariano-H. Cornejo's new book, *Sociologie Générale*. They concern questions of race, and of marriage and the family. Quoting from Schiller to the effect that while philosophers are finding out how to govern the world, hunger and love are doing the work for them, he starts from primitive promiscuity, touches on all the phases of marriage regulation and domestic government, and ends with the

family of the present day, which is held together, he considers, by the bonds of property and inheritance only. The psychology of races and peoples, he tells us, is entirely delusive. Nations are made, not born; and the more freely they avail themselves of modern facilities for intercommunication, the more misty and unscientific the race idea becomes.

LA SCIENCE SOCIALE for May and June contains reports of the annual meetings of the International Society of Social Science opened by M. Paul de Rousiers on May 15th. His introductory address gave special prominence to the instructional work, begun by Edmond Demolins and continued by M. Paul Bureau, by which the Society has educated the schools and the public for thirty years. Not content with sending out trained workers to make studies of various social groups, it has recently founded "a nursery of observers who will guarantee the future of social science," under the direction of M. Paul Descamps; and a normal course by means of which M. Paul Roux is teaching students how to put sociological theory into practice. To mention only one or two of the subjects of a most interesting Conference, M. Blanchon maintained that with the growing complexity of society a man's freedom in relation to persons diminished, while in relation to things it increased; and M. Joseph Durieu established the thesis that short intervals of payment are associated with lack of thrift on the part of employees, by giving comprehensive accounts of certain industrial and agricultural wage-earners, and of the *mégotier*, who earns his living by picking up cigar-ends, the *bagotier*, or casual porter, and the *bandiste*, or envelope-addresser, who is frequently a university man.

The "Document" of LE MUSÉE SOCIAL for April is a synopsis of all the French industries, by M. R. S. Carmichael, which is intended to substantiate the contention, *Pas de progrès général sans prospérité économique*. The survey includes finance, and even humanitarianism, as the hygienic movement that is maintaining and increasing the national wealth reckoned in vitality. M. Carmichael has much to say in praise of the get-on-or-get-out type of Englishman, and expresses a doubt as to whether the theorizing Frenchman is not so managing that a time will come when he possesses nothing to manage.

The May number is a report of an experiment on co-operative credit which has been tried by the farmers in the province of the High Pyrenees.

The March number is a history of *Une Société féminine d'Assistance publique* which was founded by Rivadavia at Buenos Ayres in 1823, survived the wars which culminated in the formation of the Argentine Republic, and is to-day a hospital and orphanage of the most modern type.

Amidst a good deal of logic and epistemology the REVUE DE MÉTAPHYSIQUE ET DE MORALE for March gives a translated chapter on Experimental Logic from Professor Baldwin's "Thought and Things," a criticism of M. Fouillée's *Le Socialisme et la Sociologie réformatrice*, and an article by M. Colonna D'Istria on *Cabanis et les origines de la vie psychologique*. M. D'Istria points out that the author of *Les Rapports du Physique et du Moral de l'homme*, which was first published in 1802, pursued his medical studies far enough, at an unpropitious time, to demonstrate the existence of what is now called the *coenæsthesis*, and thus to undermine Condillac's theory of mental action as consisting in perception and consciousness only, and to prepare the way for the present-day doctrine of the subconsciousness.

In the May number M. Lévy Bruhl gives us a brief appreciation of Cournot as one of the first thinkers who put philosophy on a positive basis. Neglected in his lifetime, Cournot seems now to be coming to the front; and at the instance of the readers of this Review a new edition of his *Traité de l'enchaînement des Idées fondamentales* is now being published. M. P. Tisserand writes on *Dieu dans la*

philosophie de Lagneau; and M. A. Lalande *Sur quelques textes de Bacon et de Descartes*, suggesting that in the Cartesian there are substantial borrowings from the Baconian philosophy.

GERMAN.

To the March-April issue of the *ARCHIV FÜR RASSEN-GESELLSCHAFTS-BIOLOGIE* Dr. Siebert, of Munich, contributes a combination of positive science and metaphysics entitled *Die Rassenidee und die liberale Weltanschauung*, in which he compares the German idea of personality with the French conception of liberty, and reconciles them, through the scientific doctrine of race, in the unscientific love of nationality. Into this he puts a very German will factor. Not in so far as it is good, or progressive, or eugenic, or scientific, should a man support a policy or adopt a fresh point of view, but in the measure in which it is characteristically national. "What shall it benefit us," he quotes from Klaus Wagner, "if we gain the whole world of culture and knowledge and lose our national identity?"—In *Volkserneurung* Dr. Grassl deals, rather discursively, with different methods of making marriage useful to society as a selective agency, and of producing people for the work and work for the people of a present-day nation in fitting proportions.

In the January-February number Dr. Wilhelm Weinberg discusses *Fertility in Relation to Race Hygiene*. It is not proven, his conclusion is, either that the universal tendency towards the reduction of fertility is associated with degeneration, or that the stocks of the best biological worth are on the decrease.—Dr. Heinz Potthoff, in *Schutz der Schwachen?* asks whether charity is a luxury that Germany can afford. Why keep thousands of joyless idiots and lunatics, when healthy folk whose weakness is economic only are dying every day in consequence of the industrial struggle?—Professor von Ehrenfels gives the reader some *Leitziele zur Rassenbewertung*. Viability and the capacity for civilisation are his criteria of race fitness. He asks how we are to defeat the tendency of peace and social education to create a type of conservative non-producers who live at the expense of the engineers of society; and makes some attempt to determine precisely the standard of living, density of population and other environmental factors which together favour the greatest possible exercise of constructive activity by the greatest possible number of people.—Dr. Alfred Hegar discusses biological, and historical and legendary repetitions of ancestral traits, in a paper on *Die Wiederkehr des Gleichen und die Vervollkommenung des Menschengeschlechts*, which is a plea for the education of the public up to the determination to sanction hygienic marriages only.

The sociological matter in the *GERMAN QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY* for March consists in a continuation of the Editor's studies on *Die Geschichte der Erziehung in soziologischer Beleuchtung*. This chapter is a straightforward account of the industrial revolution of the 19th century, with special reference to the phases it assumed in England. Along with the record of the events of the period, and of the personalities by which they were brought about, he traces the thought movement, which, beginning with Adam Smith's theory of natural freedom, has passed through economic liberalism, and through socialism, to the conception of a national economy based on evolutionary science.

ITALIAN.

REVISTA ITALIANA DI SOCIOLOGIA, Marzo-Aprile, 1911.—B. Brugi: *Realtà Sociale e Metafisica Politica*. The tendencies of nationalism and internationalism are often opposed to each other owing to imperfect analysis. No clear definition of what

constitutes civic society. Relativity of the term nation apparent in the Roman age—the "patria" of the people, not that of the poet and jurist. Country and nationality may express a class ideal. At the present time too much importance must not be attributed to a peace policy which promises to be advantageous to strong communities and dangerous to weaker ones; a desire for universal peace may be compatible with the maintenance of the injustice of existing conditions, while it does not lead to the diminution of the apparatus of war. Far otherwise is the attempt to promote solid relations between people and people and to support a disinterested arbitration. Socialism is the most important cosmopolitan factor to-day. G. Mazzarella: *Le forme di aggregazione sociale nell'India*. Note e Comunicazioni, A. Di Pietri-Tonnelli: *Le onde economiche*. There is nothing arbitrary in the statement that economic conditions may be regarded as a system of forces, which tend towards a certain equilibrium, as a pendulum when touched seeks to recover its stability. Every consideration makes it probable that a sound knowledge of the laws of physical vibration would aid the investigation of undulatory movement in the economic sphere. The effects produced by a good or bad harvest gradually die away like the movements of a pendulum which has received no fresh impact. E. Bodrero: *La genialità latina ed il pensiero di Giovanni Vailati*.

RIVISTA INTERNAZIONALE DI SCIENZE SOCIALI E DISCIPLINE AUSILIARIE, Marzo, 1911.—Gino Faralli: "*Chamberlain*" e l'imperialismo economico di fronte al libero scambio nella Gran Bretagna. Giulio Castelli: *Una nuova funzione sociale degli uffici postali e telegrafici*. Use of the post office as labour exchange. Every day the report of the demand for and supply of labour in the local market should be transmitted by circular telegram, and information received should be posted up. There should be a small tax payable in stamps merely to cover the necessary expense. Felice di Dominici: "*I delitti e le pene*" di Cesare Beccaria e il loro fondamento Sociale. The animating principle of the work was borrowed from contemporary philosophy from the works of Helvetius and Montesquieu. Beccaria the interpreter rather than the educator of the public conscience. Under the old order it was difficult to discriminate between right and violence, between justice and arbitrary power. The new conception of natural rights led to the maxim that penalties which exceed the necessity of maintaining the public weal are unjust in their nature. Contrast of Beccaria's theory with that of to-day as regards the character of crime. To us it is a subjective and objective act, which failing to conform to the fundamental law of justice reacts harmfully on social and individual well-being.

Aprile, 1911. Eugenio Anzilotti: *L'insegnamento professionale*.—Increasing response to the needs of technical instruction, both on the part of the central authority and the local body in Italy. The proportion of schools to population and the contributions of the locality diminish as we travel southward, except, where the influence of centres like Rome, Naples and Bari makes itself felt. Gino Faralli: "*Chamberlain*" e l'imperialismo economico di fronte al libero scambio nella Gran Bretagna.

Maggio, 1911. *L'extraterritorialità fittizia degli Stranieri al Marocco*. Sua Misura in rapporto alla giurisdizione ed alla legislazione. Morocco not only received the stranger but allowed him the benefit of his own laws, thus establishing a State within a State. The measure of his exemption from the law and jurisdiction of the country, in what form and under what circumstances convention and treaty have destroyed local jurisdiction, how far the European is amenable to his national law, to local law or to a special law, in what manner sentences are carried out amid such confusion all these are most important questions, both practically and theoretically; this article deals with jurisdiction. Signor Faralli completes in this number his study of economic imperialism and free trade in Great Britain.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, Vol. xvi, No. 5 (March).—In an article on *The Relation of Social Theory to Public Policy*, Franklin H. Giddings shows that the tendency of the world is to prefer peace to war, and he points out some factors which now preclude effective government by discussion. These are technical proficiency based on scientific knowledge and concentrated economic power. In order to secure peace we must be willing to see a vast equalizing of industrial efficiency between East and West; a fairer apportionment of natural resources among nations and within them, and a more equal distribution of wealth. If these conditions cannot be met, a nominal government by discussion will be but a tournament of words.—*The Racial Element in Social Assimilation* is discussed by Ulysses G. Weatherley, who has found certain principles possessing some of the characteristics of established laws, which give a summary of the processes of contact and assimilation, so far as they relate to racial elements. The rough proof and test of race assimilation lies in the possibility of general and successful intermarriage.—In *The 'Social Forces' Error*, Edward C. Hayes enters a protest against the loose way in which the word "force" is used by sociologists. Human actions should be referred to "motives." No amount of reference of social activities to feelings can constitute a scientific explanation of them, or open the way to the desired practical applications. In a given physical and social environment, men of given organic predispositions will in general respond with certain feelings, which are a part of the activity to be explained by science and to be induced or repressed by social practice, and not the causes antecedent to social activity.—John M. Gillette in a paper upon *The Drift to the City in Relation to the Rural Problem* demonstrates the degree of movement from country to city, and the significance of this movement for rural communities.

Vol. xvi, No. 6 (May).—Edward A. Ross: *Sociological Observations in Inner China*. China is the European Middle Ages made visible. The most outstanding thing in the Far East is the pressure of population upon means of subsistence. This is due to a family system that eliminates every prudential check on multiplication. The physical constitution of Chinamen is better fitted for a hard life. They suffer less from surgical shock when operated upon, on account of their abstinence from alcohol; their resistance to fevers and other infections is attributed to their vegetable diet and their stoical bearing to ignorance and lack of appreciative imagination. Intellectually the Chinese are quite equal to white men. The family government is based on two ideas, the superiority of the male over the female, and the superiority of the old over the young.—J. E. Cutler, *Some Suggestions Regarding the Organization of a Department of Sociology in an Urban University*, gives a useful description of the plan upon which Mr. Cutler worked out his lecture courses with the aim of providing definite training for social work.—E. W. Capen discusses the *Sociological Appraisal of Western Influence*, and W. Laidlaw *The Church and the City Community*.—T. J. Riley in *Sociology and Social Surveys* deals with a subject which should be especially familiar to members of the English Sociological Society.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS, Vol. xxi, No. 3 (April).—Professor W. S. Urquhart of Calcutta considers one of the most noticeable tendencies of our day in a paper on *The Fascination of Pantheism*. Pantheism, he says, satisfies our desire for penetration into real being, our craving for the permanent elements in experience. It has a special appeal to the scientific mind, its revival in the modern world being due largely to action and reaction between religion and science. The whole tendency might be described as the underpinning of empiricism by religion. Pantheism tends to become the faith of the poet and mystic.—Miss M. E. Robinson contributes an

interesting paper on *The Sex Problem*, in which it is pointed out that, from a psychological point of view, the sex trouble is due to crowd morality. The miseries to which sex impulses give rise are the product of hypnotism and suggestion. The feminine craving for mere display and amusement is for the most part a responsive attitude taken up in deference to masculine taste. Both boys and girls, by the time they reach physical maturity, should understand the whole mechanism of sex; and adults ought to know something of its abnormalities, because without this knowledge it is impossible either to understand the present or to read history aright. Two-thirds of the sufferings of the world are of sexual origin. The worst of them, Miss Robinson thinks, could be remedied by the sterilization of criminals and lunatics, trial marriages without children, and the enforcement of parental responsibility.—Professor W. J. S. Mackenzie discusses *The Meaning of Good and Evil*.

ECONOMIC JOURNAL, Vol. xxi, No. 82 (June).—Mr. I. G. Gibbon's paper on *Insurance against Sickness, Invalidity and Old Age in Germany* considers the question under the headings of general organization, administration, benefits, health, and pauperism. Against such dangers of a national scheme as malingering and the possible reduction of the general health standard, must be placed the facts that insurance is of immense advantage to the workman, and that the discreet extension of insurance is one of the most urgent needs of the time. A well-devised and soundly-administered system should certainly improve the general standard of health and help to reduce poverty. The English scheme aims at avoiding some of the pitfalls of German insurance.—Prof. R. A. Lehfeldt considers *The Shift System of the Witwatersrand Mines*, which he regards as the most perfect example of working by shifts at present in existence. Popular sentiment is inclined to adopt a white labour policy and in time this may be enforced for political reasons. If the shift system were not employed it is calculated that there would be an increased cost of 42 per cent. on working expenses.—Other articles: *Under-employment and the Mobility of Labour*; *The Taxation of Unearned Increment in Germany*.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, Vol. xxv, No. 3.—Allyn A. Young, under the heading of *Some Limitations of the Value Concept*, discusses the pure theory of exchange and points out its application to a general group of problems in which value figures as a measure of the existing stock of wealth. Failure to take account of some limitations in the value concept is pointed out, and national wealth, taken by itself, is stated to give us merely the sum of the imputed prices of individual property rights.—An article by Jacob H. Hollander on *The Development of the Theory of Money from Adam Smith to David Ricardo* affords a good historical appendix to the foregoing, and W. J. Cunningham's paper on *Scientific Management in the Operation of Railroads* considers the finding of the Inter-State Commerce Commission upon alleged railway inefficiency. A case is cited where an increased output of 300 per cent. had been obtained in a business firm by the system of scientific management.

EUGENICS REVIEW, Vol. iii, No. 1.—Mr. Montague Crackanthorpe contributes an appreciation of Sir Francis Galton with particular reference to his work in eugenics.—Dr. Edgar Schuster gives a synopsis of the papers issued by the Galton Research Laboratory, dealing with the inheritance of ability, insanity and vision, and the influence of parental alcoholism on offspring.—J. H. F. Kohlbrugge in a paper on *The Influence of a Tropical Climate on Europeans* describes the results obtained in Batavia. A tropical environment, he says, produces no essential bodily changes. Paleness is due to softening and thickening of the epidermis and the opaqueness

caused by the atmosphere, charged with moisture, preventing perspiration from evaporating. No white race can survive in the tropics without race-mixture. While European methods of work and education do not injure the individual in the tropics they do injure his descendants. The conclusion is arrived at that for a European to settle permanently in a tropical country, he must discard civilization and live according to local custom. As we cannot become acclimatised neither can we take the place of the native, or do without him.—Dr. Arabella Kenealy considers the case of a degenerate who is apparently healthy, concluding that the exception to heredity is apparent rather than real when both parents are sickly.—H. H. Goddard's paper on *Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness* is accompanied by 15 diagrams. Of a family of 319 members 119 appear in the tables as feeble-minded and only 42 normal.

TOWN PLANNING REVIEW, Vol. ii, No. 1.—Two papers are of importance. The first is Prof. Adshead's on *Monumental Arches*. Their history is traced from Roman times, their ornamental qualities are considered, as well as their decline in the Mediaeval period and a word or two is said on the subject of arches as temporary decorative features.—The second paper is by Dr. E. W. Marchant on *The Possibilities of Development in the Transmission of Electrical Energy and its Effects on Towns*. This is a subject which is certain to be of great importance in the near future. The advantages of centralising power supply are indicated, the difficulties in the use of overhead wires considered, and the advantages of the electrification of suburban railway lines pointed out.—Mr. Abercrombie discusses Boston, U.S.A., and Mr. J. E. Jarratt, the Town Clerk of Southport, outlines his proposals for the improvement of that town.

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY, Vol. xxvi, No. 2 (June).—Two aspects of the race problem in America are dealt with in this number: R. P. Brooks considering a region of Georgia and D. Y. Thomas discussing *Southern Non-Slaveowners in 1860*.—Other articles are: L. B. Boudin, *Government by Judiciary*, and T. H. Boggs on the Government of India.

Also received:—"Man," "Open Court," "The Highway," "Hindustan Review," "La Lectura Revistade Ciencias y de Artes" (April, May), "Revista Bimestre Cubana" (March-April), "Progress," "Monist," "Scottish Geographical Magazine" (April, May, June).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Dickinson, G. Lowes. "Religion and Immortality." Dent Sons. 1/- net.
- Temple, William. "The Nature of Personality." Macmillan. 2/6 net.
- Comte, Auguste. (Trans. from the French by Henry Dix Hulton). "Early Essays on Social Philosophy." Routledge. 1/- net.
- Murray, Rev. R. H. "Revolutionary Ireland and its Settlement." Macmillan. 10/- net.
- Strachey, Sir John. "India and its Administration." Macmillan. 10/- net.
- Hedin, Sven. "Overland to India." 2 vols. Macmillan. 30/- net.
- Hay, J. Stuart. "The Amazing Emperor Heliogabalus." Macmillan. 8/6 net.
- Fowler, W. Warde. "The Religious Experience of the Roman People." Macmillan. 12/- net.
- Frazer, J. G. "The Golden Bough: Part II. Taboo and the Perils of the Soul." Macmillan. 10/- net.
- Annales du Musée du Congo Belge. Series III. Ethnographie, Anthropologie. Tome II. Fasc. I. E. Torday and T. A. Joyce. "Notes Ethnographiques sur les Peuples . . . Bakuba . . . ainsi les Bushongo." Aquarelles par Norman H. Hardy. Le Ministère des Colonies Belges.
- Platon, G. "Pour le Droit Naturel." Rivière et Cie. 1 fr. 50.
- Antonelli, Etienne. "La Démocratie Sociale." Rivière et Cie. 3 francs.
- Cornejo, M. H. (Trans. into French from the Spanish by Emile Chauffard). "Sociologie Générale." 2 vols. Giard et Brière. 20 francs.
- Alhaiza, A. "Charles Fourier et sa Sociologie Sociétaire." Rivière et Cie. 75 centimes.
- Grasserie, Raoul de la. "Les Principes Sociologiques du Droit Publique." Giard et Brière. 10 and 11 francs.
- Kovalewsky, Maxime. "La France économique et sociale à la Veille de la Révolution." Giard et Brière 7 and 8 francs.
- Majewski Erasme de. "La Théorie de l'Homme et de la Civilisation." Le Soudier. 8 francs.
- Majewski, Erasme de. "La Science de la Civilisation." 2nd edition. Felix Alcan. 6 francs.

- Levy, Dr. Hermann. (Trans. by Ruth Kenyon). "Large and Small Holdings." Cambridge University Press. 10/6 net.
- Greenwood, Arthur. "Juvenile Labour Exchanges." P. S. King & Son. 1/- net.
- Webb, Sidney. "Grants in Aid: A Criticism and a Proposal." Longmans. 5/- net.
- Fairchild, Henry Pratt. "Greek Immigration to the United States." Oxford University Press. 8/6 net.
- Fisher, Irving. "The Purchasing Power of Money." Macmillan. 12/6 net.
- Key, Ellen. (Trans. from the Swedish by Arthur G. Chater, with an Introduction by Havelock Ellis). "Love and Marriage." Putnam's Sons. 6/- net.
- George, W. L. "A Bed of Roses." Frank Palmer. 6/-.
- Chapman, Cecil. "Marriage and Divorce." David Nutt. 2/- net.
- "The Position of Women: Actual and Ideal." With a Preface by Sir Oliver Lodge. Nisbet & Co. 3/6 net.
- Welton, J. "The Psychology of Education." Macmillan. 7/6 net.
- Bagley, W. C. "Craftsmanship in Teaching." Macmillan. 5/- net.
- Ferguson, Charles. "The University Militant." Mitchell Kennerley. \$1.00 net.
- Holmes, Edmond G. A. "What is and What Might Be: a Study of Education in general and Elementary Education in particular." Constable & Co. 4/6 net.
- Punnett, R. C. "Mendelism." Macmillan. 5/- net.
- Welby, Hon. V. Lady. "Significs and Language." Macmillan. 3/6 net.
- Home University Library. John Masefield: "Shakespeare." Hilaire Belloc: "The French Revolution." Dr. Marion Newbigin: "Modern Geography." Mrs. J. R. Green: "Irish Nationality." Dr. W. S. Bruce: "Polar Exploration." Dr. D. H. Scott: "Evolution of Plants." Dr. C. A. Mercier: "Crime and Insanity." Professor F. W. Gamble: "The Animal World." Dr. A. N. Whitehead: "Introduction to Mathematics." H. W. C. Davis: "Medieval Europe." Sir H. H. Johnston: "The Opening-up of Africa." Professor D. S. Margoliouth: "Mohammedanism." Professor L. T. Hobhouse: "Liberalism." J. A. Hobson: "The Science of Wealth." Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie: "Health and Disease." Prof. J. Arthur Thomson, and Prof. Patrick Geddes: "Evolution." Williams & Norgate. 1/- each net.
- Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature. Dr. C. S. Myers: "An Introduction to Experimental Psychology." G. G. Alexander: "The Administration of Justice in Criminal

Matters (England and Wales)." Prof. F. B. Jevons: "The Idea of God in Early Religions." Dr. John Brown: "The English Puritans." Prof. W. W. Skeat: "English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day." J. W. Judd: "The Coming of Evolution." D. A. Barker: "Cash and Credit." Cambridge University Press. 1/- each net.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

The regular meetings of the season came to an end on May 2, when Mr. George Paish read, at an afternoon meeting, the paper on "Savings and the Social Welfare," published in the present number. Mr. A. C. Cole, Governor of the Bank of England, was in the chair.

An extra meeting is being arranged for July at which Professor W. E. B. Du Bois will read a paper on "The Economics of Negro Emancipation in America." The meeting will be held on the 18th, at 8.15 p.m., and the chair will be taken by Sir Sydney Olivier, K.C.M.G., Governor of Jamaica.